

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974

MAY 16 AND 24, 1960

Serial XX

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1960

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina, *Chairman*

W. R. POAGE, Texas, *Vice Chairman*

GEORGE M. GRANT, Alabama
E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma
WATKINS M. ABBITT, Virginia
CLARK W. THOMPSON, Texas
PAUL C. JONES, Missouri
HARLAN HAGEN, California
LESTER R. JOHNSON, Wisconsin
ROSS BASS, Tennessee
W. PAT JENNINGS, Virginia
D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS, Florida
GEORGE S. McGOVERN, South Dakota
MERWIN COAD, Iowa
J. FLOYD BREEDING, Kansas
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, Kentucky
HAROLD B. McSWEEN, Louisiana
EARL HOGAN, Indiana
ROBERT W. LEVERING, Ohio

CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa
PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania
PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma
CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE, Maine
HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Utah
WINT SMITH, Kansas
CHARLES M. TEAGUE, California
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
DON L. SHORT, North Dakota
CATHERINE MAY, Washington
ALEXANDER PIRNIE, New York
DELBERT L. LATTA, Ohio

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER, *Clerk*
HYDE H. MURRAY, *Assistant Clerk*
JOHN J. HEIMBURGER, *Counsel*
FRANCIS M. LEMAY, *Consultant*

CONTENTS

	Page
H.R. 10876. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.....	1
H.R. 10974. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.....	2
Statement of—	
Andre, Dean Floyd, College of Agriculture, Iowa State University...	25
Bailey, Hon. Cleveland M., a Representative in Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of West Virginia.....	64
Caldwell, John T., chancellor, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C., and chairman of the legislative committee, American Association of Land-grant Colleges and State Universities; accompanied by Dean Floyd Andre, College of Agriculture, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.....	3
Corley, James, vice president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.....	72
Hardin, Chancellor Clifford M., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., president, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.....	53
Hechler, Hon. Ken, a Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of West Virginia.....	65
Johnson, Reuben R., National Farmers Union.....	31
Kuhn, Dr. Albin O., executive vice president, University of Maryland.....	65
Monagan, Hon. John S., a Representative in Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Connecticut.....	35
Morgan, William E., president, Colorado State University.....	72
Pardue, Dr. Louis A., vice president and dean of the Graduate School, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.....	80
Randolph, Hon. Jennings, a U.S. Senator from the State of West Virginia.....	63
Stahr, Elvis J., Jr., president, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.....	61
Thackrey, Russell I., executive secretary, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, Washington, D.C....	2
Additional data submitted to the committee by—	
American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. Allotment of funds to States and territories for land-grant colleges and universities, proposed.....	82
Expenditures of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds, by field, year ended June 30, 1959 (table).....	70
Explanation of proposed legislation.....	15
Federal annual appropriations for instruction at land-grant colleges and universities, present.....	81
Members of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.....	14
Thackrey, Russell I., executive secretary, Washington, D.C., letter of May 25, 1960.....	68
“The Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 1862-1962—An American Institution,” article from Higher Education, November 1959, by Russell I. Thackrey and Jay Richter.....	8
Breeding, Hon. J. Floyd:	
Kansas State University, James A. McCain, president, Manhattan, Kans., letter of May 27, 1960.....	79

Additional data submitted to the committee by—Continued

Cooley, Hon. Harold D.:

	Page
Bowles, Hon. Chester, letter of June 3, 1960.....	48
Department of Agriculture, E. L. Peterson, Assistant Secretary, Washington, D.C., letter of May 23, 1960.....	52
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary, letter of May 23, 1960.....	52
Larson, D. T., Berlin, Conn., letter of May 16, 1960.....	49
Meyer, Hon. William H., letter of May 27, 1960.....	48
University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz., telegram of May 23, 1960..	50
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, letter of May 20, 1960....	44
Auburn University, Auburn, Ala., letter of May 18, 1960.....	36
Clemson College, Clemson, S.C., letter of May 20, 1960.....	46
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn., letter of May 20, 1960..	45
University of Georgia, Athens, letter of May 18, 1960.....	48
University of Illinois, Urbana, letter of May 19, 1960.....	38
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., telegram of May 19, 1960.....	50
University of Maine, Orono, Maine, letter of May 19, 1960.....	39
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, letter of May 19, 1960.....	39
Michigan State University, East Lansing, letter of May 20, 1960, with statement.....	43
Mississippi State University, State College, Miss., letter of May 18, 1960.....	46
University of Missouri, Columbia, letter of May 19, 1960.....	37
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., letter of May 19, 1960..	40
University of Nevada, Reno, letter of May 18, 1960.....	38
University of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H., telegram of May 23, 1960.....	51
North Dakota Agriculture College, Fargo, N. Dak., telegram of May 19, 1960.....	50
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, telegram of May 24, 1960.....	51
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, letter of May 18, 1960....	40
Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg., telegram of May 24, 1960..	50
Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., letter of May 21, 1960.....	45
University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I., telegram of May 21, 1960.....	51
Rutgers, the State University, New Brunswick, N.J., letter of Mason W. Gross, dated June 1, 1960.....	49
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, letters of May 20 and 21, 1960, with statement.....	41-42
University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., letter of May 20, 1960..	37
Virginia State College, Petersburg, Va., letter of May 18, 1960..	36
Washington State University, Pullman, Wash., letter of May 20, 1960.....	47
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., letter of May 20, 1960..	47

INCREASED FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1960

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a.m., in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. Harold D. Cooley (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Cooley, Poage, Grant, Gathings, Abernethy, Albert, Thompson, Jones of Missouri, Hagen, Matthews, Coad, Breeding, Hogan, Levering, Hoeven, McIntire, Dixon, Teague of California, Quie, Pirnie, and Latta.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; Hyde H. Murray, assistant clerk; John J. Heimburger, counsel; and Francis M. LeMay, consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

We have before us this morning H.R. 10876, which I introduced, and H.R. 10974, introduced by Dr. Dixon of Utah.

(H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 follow:)

[H.R. 10876, 86th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

"(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

"(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

"The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion

of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section."

[H.R. 10974, 86th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended June 12, 1952 (Public Law 390, Eighty-second Congress), be further amended as to section 22, to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (U.S.C., title 7, secs. 301-328; Supp. VII, sec. 304), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

"(a) For the fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

"(b) For the first fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

"The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The first witness I will call is Mr. Thackrey, executive Secretary of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

Will you come forward, please, Mr. Thackrey? We shall be delighted to hear you.

**STATEMENT OF RUSSELL I. THACKREY, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE
UNIVERSITIES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Mr. THACKREY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Russell I. Thackrey, and I am executive secretary of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, which consists of 70 member colleges and universities, in all of the States and Puerto Rico, of which 69 are land-grant institutions.

My role here this morning is chiefly to answer questions, as we would like to have our testimony presented by two men, Chancellor John T. Caldwell, of North Carolina State College, who is chairman of the legislative committee of our association, and also former president of the University of Arkansas, and Dean Floyd Andre, of the College of Agriculture, Iowa State University, at Ames, Iowa.

With your permission, I should like to have them present their statements.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Dr. Caldwell, we will be very glad to hear from you now, sir.

STATEMENT OF JOHN T. CALDWELL, CHANCELLOR, NORTH CAROLINA STATE COLLEGE, RALEIGH, N.C., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES; ACCOMPANIED BY DEAN FLOYD ANDRE, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY, AMES, IOWA

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John T. Caldwell and I am chancellor of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh. I appear before you in that capacity and as chairman of the Legislative Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. This organization consists of 70 members, 68 of which are land-grant institutions, located in all the 50 States and Puerto Rico.

The bill before you has a very simple objective: To increase the support by the Federal Government of college teaching in the national system of land-grant colleges and universities, which was founded by Federal action and has for nearly a century carried on national functions while under the control and direction of duly established State authorities. There is general agreement among all college and university officials that funds for faculty salaries are the most critical need of our colleges and universities at the present time. The land-grant institutions have been receiving direct Federal appropriations for teaching purposes since the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890. These funds have not been increased since 1935. What we are proposing is an increase simply to bring them up to the same standard, in terms of the formula on which they are appropriated, as they were 25 years ago. This would still leave the proportion of Federal funds involved far, far less than it was 25 years ago.

The national system of land-grant colleges and universities was established by the passage of the first Morrill Act in 1862. Under this act each State was offered grants of Federal land proportionate to its membership in Congress, the land to be sold and the proceeds invested as a permanent endowment fund for the support of teaching in at least one college in each State. This college was to emphasize "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto" and to include military tactics in its course offering. The act provided that "other scientific and classical subjects should not be excluded" and said that the great objective was the "liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

It was apparently the intention of the Congress at the time of the passage of the first Morrill Act that the income from the national endowment would fully support instruction in these colleges. The States were required to furnish the buildings and equipment, or see that they were furnished. Control over the methods of instruction, et cetera, was reserved entirely to the States.

As time passed it became clear that the income from the land-endowment would not support the instructional program of the colleges if they were to meet the needs of the young people of their States and of the Nation. Thus State support for instruction, as well as for buildings and equipment, became an increasingly important factor.

In 1890 the Congress recognized that Federal instructional support from the land-endowment investment was far short of what had been contemplated, and passed the second Morrill Act, providing direct annual grants to the colleges for instruction in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto." This act was passed unanimously in both Houses of the Congress. In 1907 it was amended and increased, and constitutes a permanent annual appropriation act in the amount of \$2,550,000, representing \$50,000 to each State and Puerto Rico for use in supporting instruction in the land-grant institutions of those States.

In 1935, during the emergency of the depression, the Congress included in the Bankhead-Jones Act, as authored by this committee, a provision which granted an additional \$20,000 to each State for teaching purposes in its land-grant institutions, and an additional amount which is distributed to each State on the basis of population. The total of funds authorized under this title of the Bankhead-Jones Act is now \$2,501,500, of which \$1 million is distributed on the basis of \$20,000 to each of the 50 States; and the remainder on a population basis. Puerto Rico is not included in this act, and we propose that it be included as the act is amended.

That higher education now faces another emergency, Mr. Chairman, is too well known to need elaboration here. What we propose is not a far-reaching or all-embracing measure. It involves no change whatever in long-established principles of State and Federal relationships.

It will be available for the advanced education of all segments of the population in all the States.

It involves none of the controversial problems of all kinds that arise whenever Federal aid to higher education is discussed. The justification of it is simple. Since 1935 we have had an inflation of 100 percent. Between 1935 and 1959 the population of the United States, upon which a section of the apportionment of land-grant funds is based, has increased 40 percent.

The present total of annual appropriations to land-grant institutions for teaching purposes from the Morrill Act of 1890 as amended, and the Bankhead-Jones Act, is \$5,051,500.

That is from the two acts.

We propose that this be increased by applying the 40 percent population increase factor, and then applying the 100 percent inflationary factor. Something more than this is involved since we also propose to include Puerto Rico on an equal basis with other institutions, which requires an additional sum to bring it first up to the present basis of other institutions and then to make the increase provided, including an allowance for Puerto Rico, on a population basis.

Since the second Morrill Act of 1890 is a permanent appropriation we would prefer not to disturb it, Mr. Chairman. Therefore we have proposed that the full amount of the increase justified be applied to section 22 of the Bankhead-Jones Act. This would increase the authorization under that act, which is now \$2,501,500, by \$9,448,500, to a total of \$11,950,000. Please keep in mind that this figure represents the justifiable increases as applied to both acts, though it is offered as an amendment to only one of them.

I have said this is a modest proposal, Mr. Chairman. Had we used the increase in enrollment in the land-grant institutions since 1935 as a basis, which several of our members suggested as being equitable, the increase requested would be several times as large. Enrollments in the land-grant institutions were about 190,000 in 1935. Of these only 15,000 were in the advanced and highly expensive and important category of graduate students. Currently the enrollments are approximately 650,000, of which 75,000 are graduate students. Thus there is a 340-percent increase in total enrollment and a 500-percent increase in graduate enrollment. As opposed to this we have asked only for the 40 percent increase factor based on population growth. An increase of at least \$30 million would be justified on an enrollment basis.

What are the funds used for?

Mr. Chairman, land-grant teaching funds are available for support of instruction in a wide range of basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. The only limitation placed on their use is that they be expended for teaching in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto."

Fortunately, the interpretation of this language has been broad, as Congress clearly intended it to be, and has permitted support of instruction in accordance with the changing scientific and technical needs of our society. Thus instruction is supported in the basic fields of physical science such as chemistry, physics, and metallurgy, as well as in all the fields of engineering which are based on the application of these subjects. They may be used in botany, zoology, bacteriology, and entomology—the sciences basic to agriculture, as well as in the applied fields of agriculture itself. They may be used for mathematics, essential in all scientific fields, and for basic instruction in English. They may also be used for support of the important and growing field of veterinary medicine, so basic both to human and animal health.

To give you some idea of the importance of the land-grant institutions in our scientific and technological civilization, Mr. Chairman, let me quote a few figures:

The 68 land-grant institutions constitute fewer than 5 percent of all the institutions of higher education of all kinds in the United States—and at the last count, we have about 2,011 institutions beyond high school, that is the 3-year and 4-year institutions, but 5 percent of all of the institutions of higher education in number, enroll more than 21 percent of all the students in 4-year colleges and universities. But their significance is out of all proportion to their enrollment.

They train 100 percent of all those who receive doctors' degrees in agriculture—the highest level of training—and more than 80 percent of all those getting bachelor's degrees in that field.

In the basic biological sciences, they grant 56 percent of all doctor's degrees—the level of training required for research, and over 50 percent at the master's degree level, required for secondary teaching in this important field. Ninety-five percent of all entomologists in this country, the men and women who deal with our insect pests, get their first degrees at land-grant institutions, as do 55 percent of all people who start out in bacteriology and its related fields so essential in both agriculture and in the health sciences. About 37 percent of all students who later go into medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry get their first degrees at land-grant institutions.

You know of the importance of mathematics in today's world. Thirty percent of all those who get master's degrees in mathematics in the United States—the level required for secondary school teaching—get these degrees at land-grant institutions; while at the doctoral level required for high level research and college teaching the figure is more than 39 percent.

In the related field of statistics, the land-grant institutions grant 48 percent of all first degrees and nearly 60 percent of all doctoral degrees.

In engineering, Mr. Chairman, 41 percent of all engineers receiving their first degrees in the United States come from our institutions; while at the doctor's degree level the figure is nearly 53 percent.

And 72 percent of all the forestry students in the country get their degrees in the land-grant group.

To turn to the basic physical sciences: The land-grant institutions give 42 percent of all doctoral degrees in all fields, including 36 percent of all physicists, 40 percent of all chemists, and 73 percent of all geologists.

There is another very important area which I must mention, Mr. Chairman, because it was part of the basic philosophy of the Land-Grant Act, and that is military science and tactics.

The authors of the Land-Grant Act felt that a college education for men should include preparation to serve the country in time of national emergency. Although there was no formal way in which this training could lead to formal status in the Armed Forces prior to the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920 which founded the ROTC program, the records show that at least 100,000 men who had military training in land-grant institutions served in World War I, and that 30,000 of them became officers. These are partial figures only.

Between World War I and World War II, the land-grant institutions furnished annually from 50 to 70 percent of all young men receiving commissions via the Reserve Officers Training Corps program. General Marshall is authority for the statement that mobilization in World War II would have been delayed at least 6 months without the availability of these men.

President Eisenhower, while Chief of Staff of the Army, made a similar observation. Since World War II there has been a vast expansion of the number of colleges and universities offering military training: But the land-grant institutions, at a conservative estimate, still furnish substantially more than a third of all regular and reserve officers not supplied by the military academies.

My point is that the land-grant institutions have, in every field, met the fondest hopes of the founders of the system in their contribution to the national strength in whatever way it may be described.

I do not wish to bore you with quotations, Mr. Chairman, but when they come from outside and neutral sources they may have a value somewhat greater than the words of one long committed to the land-grant movement, as certainly I am.

In 1930 a comprehensive U.S. Office of Education survey reached the conclusion that—

The Morrill Act * * * provided for the establishment of the most comprehensive system of scientific, technical, and practical higher education the world has ever known.

Nearly 20 years later, in 1949, the task force report of the first Hoover Commission said:

The general support for resident instruction in the land-grant colleges, administered by the U.S. Office of Education, is sometimes referred to as the most effective grant-in-aid ever made by the Federal Government.

Four years later, in 1953 the National Manpower Council, established by President Eisenhower while he was president of Columbia University, reached this conclusion:

The most important single governmental step in connection with the training of scientific and professional personnel was the Morrill Act of 1862, which laid the basis for the country's extensive State college and university system * * *. The State universities and land-grant colleges have provided low-cost education, have contributed to the supply of specialized manpower, and have stimulated by their example the development of other scientific, technological, and graduate schools.

Another quotation I like, Mr. Chairman, is from Mr. John Cowles, of Minneapolis, a newspaper publisher who is a graduate of Harvard University, and who told an audience a few years ago that unless the land-grant institutions are enabled to meet their responsibilities in the years ahead, the chances of survival of this Nation as an enlightened democracy are dim indeed.

It is well known that our colleges and universities are facing a critical period in the years immediately ahead. This has come about simply because we have far more young people than we used to have, and that the necessity for them having advanced education has substantially increased in our highly complex society. Thus we have an increase both in numbers of young people and in numbers desiring to go to college. Great as the contributions of all other institutions, public and private, will be to solving this problem which is also an opportunity: The land-grant institutions will be called on to play a major role. This is particularly true in the highly skilled scientific, technical, and professional fields.

Mr. Chairman, as I said at the beginning, I believe that legislation before you represents a rather modest request to bring the legislation up to date in terms of 1960. We are grateful to Mr. Cooley, the chairman of this great committee, and to Mr. Dixon, former president of one of our fine institutions, for introducing it.

And we are grateful to each of you for your kind attention to our case.

I have with me a list of the land-grant institutions, together with a brief explanation of the method of arriving at the figures in the

bill, which with your permission I would like to place in the record with the full text of my statement.

If there are any questions, we will be glad to attempt to answer them.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for your appearance here this morning, and for the splendid statement supporting the legislation which we are now considering.

The documents you have referred to will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The documents entitled, "Higher Education," "Members of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities," and "Explanation of Proposed Legislation," follow:)

[Article from Higher Education for November 1959]

THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1862-1962—AN AMERICAN INSTITUTION

(By Russell I. Thackrey and Jay Richter¹)

Nearly a century ago the Federal Government inaugurated a dramatic revolution in higher education in the United States through the passage of the Land-Grant Act. Better known as the Morrill Act for its author, Representative (later Senator) Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont, the act was signed by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. It offered to endow at least one college in each State to serve the interests of the vast majority of the people—interests not then being served by the existing colleges.

In 1953 the National Manpower Council described this act of 1862 as "The most important single governmental step in connection with the training of scientific and professional personnel * * * which laid the basis for the country's extensive State college and university system." A task force report of the Hoover Commission in 1949 described it as "the most effective grant-in-aid ever made by the Federal Government."

THE ORIGINAL CONCEPT

The Land-Grant Act of 1862 was not the first grant of land made by the Federal Government in support of education or of higher education. The concept of national responsibility for education antedates the Constitution itself, as witness the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. But the act had several unique characteristics that remain vitally important today as we again find ourselves in need of dramatic action to solve pressing problems in higher education.

Briefly, what was the Land-Grant Act?

It was an offer to give each State which accepted its provisions 30,000 acres of land, or land scrip, for each Member of Congress from that State—to be sold to provide a permanent endowment for at least one college. The act includes these salient features:

(1) It established a classical pattern of Federal support for instruction, without Federal control. While the law specified the type of instruction that was to be stressed, the subject matter was not limited and was to be taught "in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe." The designation of institutions to be supported was left to each State. And, in direct opposition to a presently popular trend of thought, endowment revenues were to go solely for instruction; it was up to the States to pledge that buildings and

¹ Mr. Thackrey has been executive secretary-treasurer of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities since 1947. A former journalist, professor of journalism, and college dean, he was first secretary of the National 4-H Club Foundation during its organization period. He serves as a member of and consultant to various groups dealing with problems of higher education on the national and international scene. He has held faculty appointments at Kansas State College, his alma mater, and the University of Minnesota, and he has received honorary doctoral degrees from the University of New Hampshire and the University of Maine.

Mr. Richter, who is director of the centennial office of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, has been a reporter, editor, and feature writer since his graduation from the University of Minnesota. He has served in the Federal Government on several economic missions abroad and, since 1947, has been engaged in conducting a Washington bureau which provides editorial services to magazine and newspapers with emphasis on reporting and interpreting in the field of agriculture.

other facilities were provided. The authors did not suffer from the fear that "Federal aid to instruction leads to Federal control."

(2) Although the Land-Grant Act required that the "people's colleges" have as their principal object an honored place for "agriculture and the mechanic arts," it did so at the expense neither of traditional subjects nor of new claimants for a place in the educational sun. After specifying that "agriculture and the mechanic arts" should be emphasized, the act went on to say that "other scientific and classical subjects should not be excluded"—which meant, according to Mr. Morrill, that they should be included. And the grand objective was defined as "the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

(3) The act was unique in that for the first time it did say that Federal support was to be used for specific purposes rather than general purposes, although the purposes were so broadly defined as not to delimit the future.

(4) A requirement that military science be included in the curriculum was put in, almost as an afterthought, because of the lack of trained leadership available in the emergency of the Civil War. This was the forerunner of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Years later, Gen. George Marshall was to say that the R.O.T.C. program speeded mobilization in World War II by at least 6 months. More than half of the officers thus available came from land-grant institutions.

(5) Above all, the Land-Grant Act completed the breakaway of American higher education from the European tradition of education for an aristocracy based on heredity, occupation, or money.

Hereafter, the daily needs of living people were to be considered as fit subjects for study as the lives of the Roman emperors and the writings of the Greek philosophers. Teaching of methods to bridge American rivers, dig canals, and build railroads was to be a proper subject for higher education along with the accomplishments of Da Vinci. The conquest of the West with the plow was to be accorded its proper importance along with Caesar's Gallic wars.

CONFLICT AND RESOLUTION

Response by the States to passage of the Land-Grant Act was prompt. In September 1862, 2 months after it had been signed, the Iowa Legislature accepted its conditions. Nine years later 36 States had accepted the offer.

Today, there are 68 land-grant institutions, at least one in each of the 50 States and in Puerto Rico.

The situation in which the legislation was finally approved may inspire us somewhat today. The day before the act was signed on July 2, 1862, northern forces had lost a major battle in a war which threatened the very existence of the Nation. Inflation was rampant; printing press money was a fact. In this situation Mr. Lincoln approved legislation which offered to give away a substantial part of the Nation's resources in land as an investment in the future of its young people.

About 3½ years earlier, before the Civil War, legislation almost identical to that signed by Lincoln had been vetoed by President Buchanan.

"This bill has been passed at a period when we can with great difficulty raise sufficient revenue to sustain the expenses of the Government," said Buchanan in his veto message on February 24, 1859. "Surely the present is the most unpropitious moment which could have been selected for the passage of this bill * * *."

"The establishment of these colleges has prevailed over the pressing wants of the common Treasury," he continued.

"A successful struggle on the part of the State governments with the General Government for the public lands would deprive the latter of the means of performing its high duties, especially at critical and dangerous periods * * *."

The veto, of course, stood up.

A review of the law's troublous origins and its development is especially appropriate as the centennial of its enactment approaches. The Land-Grant Act of 1862 grew out of the dissatisfaction of a few far-sighted men with the educational programs of our colleges and universities as they had developed—or failed to develop—in the first half of the 19th century. Despite some pioneering by existing institutions here and there, the curriculum was pretty much frozen into a traditional mold, designed for members of the traditional professions and leisure classes. Little was being done to meet the needs of a dynamic and expanding nation in the areas of science and technology.

The immediate agitation centered on the lack of advanced training available in the fields of agriculture and engineering, or agriculture and the mechanic arts as they were then called. Pioneering institutions were established in several States. Many failed for various reasons. Some people, including our early Presidents, advocated a national university to serve the "industrial classes"—then defined as just about everybody who worked for a living.

JONATHAN BALDWIN TURNER, PROFESSOR

Among the many pioneering figures, two stand out: Jonathan Baldwin Turner, of Illinois, and Justin Smith Morrill, of Vermont. Turner, a graduate of Yale then teaching at Illinois College, as early as 1850 outlined in detail his idea of a new university.

Existing professions, said Turner, constituted 1 percent of the population and had their colleges offering a liberal education. He wanted colleges which would provide a liberal education suited to the needs of the rest of the people: the farmer, the manufacturer, the ambitious and intelligence worker who with the aid of science might transform a trade into a technology.

Turner's plan has been called the common man's educational bill of rights. In Griggsville, Ill., on May 13, 1850, where he outlined the plan for the first time in some detail in a public speech, Turner described "a university for the industrial classes in each of the States with their consequent subordinate institutes, lyceums, and high schools in each of the counties and towns."

The reaction to his plan so encouraged Turner that by March of the next year, in 1851, he wrote in a letter to the *Prairie Farmer*:

"* * * I am satisfied that if the farmers and their friends will now exert themselves they can speedily secure for this State, and for each State in the Union, an appropriation of public land adequate to create and endow in the most liberal manner, a general system of popular industrial education, more glorious in its design and more beneficent in its results than the world has ever seen before. There is wisdom enough in the State and in the Union, to plan and conduct it; there are students enough to patronize it; there is useless land and wealth enough to endow it; and there are hearts enough that want it * * *. But let us, by all means, strive together, as one man, for the glorious end of the liberal and appropriate practical education of every class, of whatever name, throughout the State, and throughout the Union."

A university graduate and scholar, Turner was also an independent thinker and outspoken critic of the "traditionalists" in education who opposed his plan.

"No wonder such educators have deemed the liberal culture of the industrial classes an impossibility," Turner said, dismissing the standpatters, "for they have never tried, nor even conceived of any other way of educating them (the industrial classes), except that by which they are rendered totally unfit for their several callings in after life * * *."

Turner's constant, aggressive work brought a petition from the Illinois Legislature to the U.S. Congress on February 8, 1853, calling for donation "to each State in the Union an amount of public lands not less in value than \$500,000 for liberal endowment of a system of industrial universities, one in each State of the Union * * *."

The Illinois professor's battle did not end with passage of the Morrill Act in 1862. He continued tirelessly to write and to speak, urging the Illinois Legislature to establish a State university under the act. Finally, on September 13, 1870, Turner laid the cornerstone of the University of Illinois at Champaign.

JUSTIN SMITH MORRILL, STATESMAN

Vermont's Justin Smith Morrill was a man in sharp contrast to Turner. The son of a blacksmith-farmer, he himself was denied a college education for want of means.

"Morrill, the politician," writes Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., vice president and provost of the University of New Hampshire, in his book, *Colleges for Our Land and Time*,¹ "was never to be caught in stinging criticism of the 'existing scheme.' In more gentle rebuke than most of his day who joined in his thinking, he was to say: 'The object * * * was not to injure any existing classical institutions, but to reinforce them and bring liberal culture within the reach of a

¹ New York, N.Y., Harper Bros., 1957.

much larger and unprovided for number of the industrial classes in every State. It was designed to largely benefit those at the bottom of the ladder who want to climb up' * * *."

Historians differ as to the respective importance of the roles played by Turner and Morrill in putting across the land-grant idea, but there is ample credit for each. In any event it was Morrill who introduced and pushed the legislation through the Congress, where he served in both House and Senate for 44 years, until his death in 1898.

In a not-so-gentle rebuke of Democratic President Buchanan, following the 1859 veto of the land-grant bill, Whig-Republican Morrill, in effect, termed that action "nonsense." In answer to the Buchanan argument that the bill was unconstitutional, Morrill snapped, "Many literary universities had already been established with the approval of James Buchanan * * *. If we can legislate for the deaf and dumb, may we not legislate for those who can hear and speak? If we can legislate for the insane, may we not legislate for the sane?"

Although the veto was upheld, Morrill lost not a single supporter in speaking out against Buchanan.

"Too many men and too many movements were involved to credit the land-grant colleges to one man," write Mr. Eddy. "In any case, it was Morrill's political acumen and keen parliamentary ability which brought the legislation into being * * *. He would not give up until his measure was finally passed 5 years after its first introduction, and attempted continually to assist the first struggling colleges with additional aid in spite of the apathy and opposition of the times * * *."

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD

Origins of the land-grant idea, of course, extend as far back as the first time man entertained thoughts of democratic self-government. An early spokesman for the concept in this country was Thomas Jefferson. In a letter dated August 13, 1786, addressed to George Wythe, he wrote:

"I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness * * *. Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils, and that the tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid * * * if we leave people in ignorance."

Since 1862 a variety of legislation has been enacted into law to strengthen the land-grant system of higher education. To summarize, briefly:

The Hatch Act, approved March 2, 1887, authorized Federal appropriations of \$15,000 annually for each State to establish an agricultural experiment station at its land-grant colleges and universities. The money was to come from sales of public land for the stations which were "to aid in acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects connected with agriculture and to promote scientific investigation and experiment respecting the principles and applications of agricultural science."

With the inauguration of college-level instruction in agriculture, it quickly became apparent that this could not be done satisfactorily without an adequate scientific basis. The Hatch Act offered Federal support to a research staff in each State on a continuing basis, to investigate basic and applied problems in the natural sciences as related to agriculture. This act, while significant in and of itself, had even greater significance in that it was an important element in establishing research as a major function of the American university. At present non-Federal sources contribute approximately \$3 for every \$1 of Federal funds expended in agricultural research through the land-grant institutions.

The Second Land-Grant Act, also sponsored by Morrill and approved, August 30, 1890, provided that each State and territory should receive \$15,000 yearly for land-grant institutions, the sum to be increased from year to year up to \$25,000. An amendment to the act, the Nelson amendment, took effect in fiscal year 1908. It provided for an eventual annual increase of \$25,000 a year, thereby doubling the total for each State and territory.

This law included a historic provision that money would be withheld from colleges which barred students on the basis of race, but also specified it could go to States where there were separate colleges for Negro and white.

The Smith-Lever Act, approved May 8, 1914, authorized instruction beyond the campus borders of the land-grant institutions. Purpose of this Extension Education Act was "to aid in diffusing among the people * * * useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage application of the same * * *."

As increased basic knowledge essential to improvement of agricultural practices became available, the problem became one of how to get into application on the farm. The Federal Government, State departments of agriculture, and the land-grant institutions all were involved in extension work, which was somewhat competitive in some States. The Congress finally resolved this situation by creating one cooperative extension service, through which research findings of both the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant institutions could be carried to the farm and into the farm home. This is a unique partnership. Extension workers are members of the staff of the land-grant institutions, and, also, for certain purposes, of the Department of Agriculture.

The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 authorized an increase in annual appropriations to the States for land-grant institutions. One million dollars annually was voted for the States, with the provision that the money be distributed as flat grants of \$20,000 to each State. An additional \$1,501,500 was authorized for allocation to the States on a proportionate population basis.

So much for legislative history.

THE PERFORMANCE RECORD

It may be of some interest to note that total annual Federal appropriations for campus teaching in the land-grant colleges—under both the second Morrill Act and the Bankhead-Jones as amended—reached a ceiling of \$5,051,500 in fiscal 1954. In addition the States today realize altogether about \$2,500,000 annually in income from the original land grants made under the first Morrill Act.

Thus, an annual sum of only about \$7½ million makes up the colleges' current total Federal endowment "for instruction." Today, Federal funds—whether for instruction, cooperative extension work, or experiment stations—are a relatively small part of the income of land-grant institutions. The largest share of their support derives from State governments.

Cooperative action to carry out this program, meantime, has cost the Federal Government astonishingly little. In the case of resident teaching, for example, Federal administrative costs represented one-seventh of 1 percent on the basis of approximately \$7 million then being received annually by the institutions, according to a 1954 report of a Land-Grant Association committee to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

"It is probable," commented the committee, headed by President Frederick L. Hovde of Purdue, "that no program ever devised has such a low annual administrative cost."

In the early years, as might be supposed, the Federal Government carried the major burden of financing, in contrast to the situation today. Yet, while there has been continual change in the relative importance of sources of support, the basic working relations of the partners has remained the same.

The tripartite program of teaching, research, and public service has been carried out without Federal interference or control.

How is this revolutionary idea for "people's colleges" working out?

A part of the answer may be found in the figures. While the land-grant institutions constitute 3.4 percent of the total number of colleges and universities in this country, they award almost 40 percent of all doctoral of philosophy degrees in all fields. These include 55 percent of the total doctorates in biology, all of those in agriculture, 43 percent in physical science, 53 percent in engineering, and 35 percent in mathematics.

The influence of the land-grant institutions extends into the homes and working lives of all Americans, and of many peoples around the world. Streptomycin, the drug used for control and treatment of tuberculosis, was discovered at a land-grant university. Another land-grant university is responsible for finding and developing dicoumarol, the chemical substance from sweetclover that prevents clotting of the blood.

The basic work on fatigue of metals that has saved the railroads millions of dollars was done at a land-grant institution. Others of the colleges and universities are responsible for the first cyclotron; for pioneering research in tele-

vision and the transistor; for the beginnings and growth of hundreds of thriving industries, from ceramics to woodpulp and soybean processing.

Land-grant institutions, moreover, have become a principal recruiting ground of governments, foundations, and commercial interests carrying out technical projects abroad. Almost every country of the world now has a working relationship of some sort with one or more of the colleges. This country's system of extension education, of course, has been adapted in every part of the globe.

THE CENTENNIAL AND NEW HORIZONS

Commemorative events are to be largely carried out during the academic year 1961-62, although substantive research associated with the centennial may be continued beyond the anniversary year. The committee of presidents planning this series of events is under the chairmanship of Clifford M. Hardin, of the University of Nebraska. Chancellor Hardin states, "Our purpose is to reexamine the origins of the land-grant colleges and universities and the job they are now doing, in order to do a better one in the future."

This steering committee has also designated education in foreign relations as "the most important, or very nearly the most important, confronting American higher education today." They agree that there is need for further adaptation in many countries, especially the underdeveloped nations, of the basic land-grant idea—that is, "to work directly with people and through education and demonstration help them solve their own problems and give their work (such as agriculture) the respectability it deserves."

The distinctive character of the land-grant institutions, the centennial planning group agrees, has been somewhat obscured, and fortunately so. This has occurred because other institutions of higher learning, private as well as public, have patterned themselves on land-grant lines.

There is no longer any "valid general distinction," the centennial planning group reported, "between the future leadership role and responsibility" of land-grant institutions and the major State universities that are not a part of the land-grant system. These universities, as well as private institutions, will be invited to join in the commemorative observance, although the initiative in centennial planning necessarily rests with the land-grant institutions.

Four areas of special responsibility, in addition to that of "leadership in international education," are being stressed by centennial planners.

Development of a pattern of higher education in the State.—Land-grant institutions and other public universities, the centennial planners have decided, ought to take the lead in developing statewide plans of higher education. "Citizen and institution alike will benefit," they have reported, "if the colleges will substitute for many of their present institutional concerns the concerns of their States."

Bringing the resources of education to bear on the whole life and all problems of the State.—This involves examination of the roles of the land-grant institutions, the non-land-grant State universities, and the mounting number of junior colleges and regional institutions in providing public services to citizen, community, and State. What part should each type of institution play in order to provide the best service at the lowest possible cost?

Continuing education.—The centennial planners agree that there is "mounting interest across the Nation in adult education," and that institutions of higher learning "should rise to the need." In general, they believe, the States "are not going in for multiple service in public adult education because it invites duplication and high costs."

Education for the professions.—This is an area, the centennial group has decided, that needs thoughtful attention. Commemorative projects will include cooperative efforts with professional groups to identify the problems, evaluate the present situation, and perhaps arrive at some recommendations for future action.

The land-grant institutions, enrolling 18 percent of the U.S. college population, confer 31 percent of doctoral degrees in the social sciences, 28 percent in business and in education, 25 percent in English, and 23 percent in literature and foreign languages.

Many billions of dollars have been added to the wealth of the Nation, in return for mere millions of investment in land-grant colleges and universities.

One farmworker in America today produces enough to feed himself and 22 others, an efficiency ratio without parallel in world history. The produc-

tivity of this country's farm plant is in large measure the result of work done by the experiment stations and the extension services.

In the U.S.S.R. 50 percent of the people work on farms, producing little more than enough to provide the Soviets an indifferent diet, while in this country 12 percent of the people feed not only themselves and everybody else in America, but also many people in other countries—and there are embarrassing surpluses left over. It was a comparison that obviously was not lost upon Mr. Khrushchev, when he visited the United States.

"Now is the time, if ever there was one," as Congressman Henry Dixon, of Utah, put it in a speech on the House floor March 9, 1959, "for the colleges and universities of this country to reappraise their way of doing things—and devise and propose better ways of doing them * * *."

"Unless we expand our support for the colleges consistent with the Nation's population growth, our democratic system of higher education for the many—instead of only a chosen few—just will not last."

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES
AND STATE UNIVERSITIES

Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.	Maryland State College, ¹ Princess Anne, Md.
Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical College, ¹ Normal, Ala.	University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
University of Alaska, College, Alaska.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.
University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.	Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.	University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Agricultural, Mechanical & Normal College, ¹ Pine Bluff, Ark.	Mississippi State University, State College, Miss.
University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and other campuses in California.	Alcorn Agricultural & Mechanical College, ¹ Alcorn, Miss.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.	University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.	Lincoln University, ¹ Jefferson City, Mo.
Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Conn.	Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.
University of Delaware, Newark, Del.	University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
Delaware State College, ¹ Dover, Del.	University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	University of New Hampshire, Durham, N.H.
Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University, ¹ Tallahassee, Fla.	Rutgers University (the State University of New Jersey), New Brunswick, N.J.
University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.	New Mexico State University, University Park, N.Mex.
Fort Valley State College, ¹ Fort Valley, Ga.	Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.	State University of New York, Albany, N.Y.
University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.	North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C.
University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.	Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, ¹ Greensboro, N.C.
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.	North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak.
Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.	Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.	Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Okla.
Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans.	Langston University, ¹ Langston, Okla.
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.	Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore.
Kentucky State College, ¹ Frankfort, Ky.	Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.	
Southern University, ¹ Baton Rouge, La.	
University of Maine, Orono, Maine.	
University of Maryland, College Park, Md.	

¹ Established as land-grant institution for Negroes.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES
AND STATE UNIVERSITIES—Continued

University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, P.R.	Agricultural & Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Tex.
University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I.	Prairie View Agricultural & Mechanical College, ¹ Prairie View, Tex.
Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson, S.C.	Utah State University, Logan, Utah.
South Carolina State College, ¹ Orangeburg, S.C.	University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
South Dakota State College, College Station, S.Dak.	Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.	Virginia State College, ¹ Petersburg, Va.
Tennessee Agricultural & Industrial State University, ¹ Nashville, Tenn.	Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.
Texas Agricultural & Mechanical College System, College Station, Tex.	West Virginia University, Morgantown, W.Va.
	University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
	University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Since the 1890 Morrill Act, as amended in 1907, provides a permanent annual appropriation, it should not be tampered with. Increases in these funds, therefore, should be achieved through the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, specifically as an amendment to section 22. It is desirable at the same time to amend the act to include Puerto Rico.

The enclosed possible draft of the proposed amendments to the Bankhead-Jones Act would (a) increase the funds appropriated by \$9,448,500, and (b) include Puerto Rico. The proposed increase over present appropriations is justified and computed as 100 percent on account of inflation since 1935 and a 40 percent increase in population since 1935.

The acts distribute one portion of the appropriations in flat, equal grants to the States and another portion on the basis of population. We have applied the 100-percent-plus-40-percent increases to each portion. Here is an analysis of the computation.

(1) The present total of flat grants to each State is \$70,000, which includes \$50,000 each under Morrill-Nelson and \$20,000 each under Bankhead-Jones. (Puerto Rico is omitted under the latter act.) The proposal is to increase the total for each State by \$130,000 (which is 100 percent plus 40 percent over the present \$70,000 allotment) and also to bring Puerto Rico into the Bankhead-Jones Act. Thus the authorization for flat, equal grants would be increased from \$1 million under Bankhead-Jones to a total of \$7,650,000, which total would include Puerto Rico. The amount of increase is \$6,650,000, which is \$130,000 times 51 plus \$20,000 (to remedy Puerto Rico's position in Bankhead-Jones).

(2) The present total of grants distributed on the basis of population is \$1,501,500. An increase in this amount by 100 percent plus 40 percent would bring this total to \$4,204,200, which we would round out to \$4,300,000, representing an increase of \$2,798,500.

Thus, the total appropriations would be as follows:

From Morrill Act	\$2, 550, 000
From Bankhead-Jones:	
Present	2, 501, 500
Increases proposed:	
Flat grants	6, 650, 000
Population basis	2, 798, 500
Subtotal	9, 448, 500
Grand total	14, 500, 000

¹ Established as land-grant institution for Negroes.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. DIXON.

Mr. DIXON. You say that the present system is based upon the figures of the population increase, on which the last was 1935; is that not right?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. DIXON. As we all know, you cannot get along now on the same status as we did in 1935. We certainly have to make more headway than that. This 40 percent factor is in the formula by which the money is being distributed now?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir. The population factor is in there. The money under the Bankhead-Jones Act is distributed on the basis of flat grants to each State—that is, equal amounts, plus a sum of money which is allocated proportionate to the population in each State.

All we propose to do is to say that since the population has increased 40 percent—and that factor was built into the original legislation—let us keep it in there and acknowledge that the population has increased.

Mr. DIXON. In arriving at this figure of \$9,400,000, you have figured in just the inflationary factor and the increase in the population?

Mr. CALDWELL. The inflationary factor, yes.

Mr. DIXON. That is all you have figured in there?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. What about your normal enrollment increase factor?

Mr. CALDWELL. As I indicated in my testimony, some of our members thought that we should make that the criteria for setting a new level of Federal support, but that would have been about \$30 million. And furthermore, Dr. Dixon, while we could have justified it, we propose to make this as simple and as straightforward a solution as possible, to say that if in 1935 the figure of something over \$5 million was considered to be a valid level in terms of the worth of the dollar and the population of the country, that, certainly, in 1960 we should bring that figure up to date. That is all we have attempted to do.

Mr. DIXON. It represents the load that the schools have to carry, and the expenses that you are put to, so that it would be even more justifiable as a criteria, would it not?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is true. I would not want to argue against increasing it, Dr. Dixon, at all.

Mr. ALBERT. Will you yield?

Mr. DIXON. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. In Oklahoma the population has not increased very much since 1940, and yet the student population at Oklahoma State University has more than doubled.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Are we going to get the benefit of this act under such circumstances when the workload has increased?

Mr. CALDWELL. I would comment that the flat rate attempts to provide that kind of equalization; that in some States, even which have lost population, the flat rate increase provided in this modest legislation would add \$130,000 to the budgets of those institutions.

And I can tell you from having been for 7 years the president of the University of Arkansas, and now being at North Carolina State College, that \$130,000 would be very, very welcome in the budget of that institution.

Mr. DIXON. In other words, the gentleman from Oklahoma's State College would profit by the 100-percent inflation factor; but if the population has not increased, he would not profit by the population factor; is that correct?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is right, sir. As a matter of fact, we have not introduced this idea of the population basis. This is a part of the 1935 act. And if the committee wants to develop an enrollment factor, that would be something else to be put in the legislation.

Mr. DIXON. It occurred to me that would be almost a sounder basis. However, the population factor is built into your permanent law?

Mr. CALDWELL. That is right.

Mr. DIXON. That is entirely reasonable as such.

What effect has this National Defense Act had upon the schools to give scholarship loans to put in more students? Has that helped schools?

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, the National Defense Education Act has brought no direct support to the institutions themselves, Dr. Dixon. It has aided the students.

Mr. DIXON. That is right.

Mr. CALDWELL. And there has been aid to special programs, as you know, such as in summer institutes for counseling and guidance training of high school teachers, et cetera, but it has brought no additional resources to the institutions themselves to do the job. It has been a fine act. I am not speaking negatively on that, but I am answering your question.

Mr. DIXON. I am glad that you made that statement; but by giving you more students, it has only added to your headaches.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. It has not helped the institutions—it has helped the students tremendously, but it has given you nothing to take care of those students.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is right.

Mr. DIXON. That is another thing that I think that we should concern ourselves about.

What about Hawaii and Alaska? You mentioned Puerto Rico.

Mr. CALDWELL. Hawaii and Alaska are included as States now. They were included as territories under the territorial provisions of the previous legislation. I do not know why Puerto Rico was left out of the 1935 legislation, but it was. At any rate, we now have 50 States and 1 territory.

Mr. DIXON. I notice, too, that land-grant scholarships which were established under the Morrill Act in 1862—that that was signed by Abraham Lincoln, and that it was for the scientific, mechanical, practical education, of the industrial classes, the common man.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. I am sure that every member of this committee is for the common man.

Is it not a fact that a resolution has been introduced setting up a committee to celebrate the centennial of the land-grant colleges in 1960?

Mr. CALDWELL. This has not become legislation yet, Dr. Dixon.

Mr. DIXON. It has not?

Mr. CALDWELL. It has not become legislation yet. It is before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DIXON. You would like it to become legislation?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, indeed. The House passed it without any opposition whatever. The Senate has not yet passed this legislation establishing a centennial commission for 1962.

Mr. DIXON. I suggest that this committee take a great deal of leadership in cooperating with the land-grant colleges in the centennial commission's assignment.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill referred to—did it pass during the present session of the Congress?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think it passed at the first session of this Congress.

Mr. THACKREY. The House passed it last year.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in the Senate?

Mr. THACKREY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you requested hearings? Or has anyone else requested an opportunity to be heard in support of the legislation?

Mr. THACKREY. It has been reported out by the committee. It is on the Senate calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have you explain to the committee and for the record just how the program happens to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Education, which was previously in the Department of the Interior, as you know, is now in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has for many years had the responsibility, since the reorganization of the administrative branches, for administering the funds to these colleges. These are instructional funds.

What sometimes seems confusing is the apparent contradiction that this particular legislation, or these funds, are administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whereas we come before the Committee on Agriculture of the House and of the Senate to discuss them.

Well, under the reorganization of Congress the agricultural colleges and matters concerning them were put under the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Committees, despite the fact that these particular funds are not for agricultural extension and agricultural research but for instruction.

How the allocation of the responsibility came about, I do not know, but the allocation of the responsibility is, in part, accidental.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hoeven has a question.

Mr. HOEVEN. Dr. Caldwell, have you given any consideration to distributing these funds on the basis of need?

Regarding the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, they first get the benefit of \$50,000 under the second Morrill Act, and \$20,000 under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and additional money on the basis of population.

Does Puerto Rico need the same kind of assistance as, some of the overcrowded institutions in the States?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir. Besides, we have not presumed to question the formula of the Bankhead-Jones Act, Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. HOEVEN. They are getting \$70,000 to start, and more, based on the basis of population.

Mr. CALDWELL. We are putting them on an equal basis with all of the other States—and Hawaii and Alaska—with respect to the flat grant, and then they will participate in the grants in the amount of

money which is distributed on the basis of the population formula by precisely the same population tests as the other States will participate.

The CHAIRMAN. What I think Mr. Hoeven has in mind, is where you have had land-grant colleges for almost 100 years, or 50 years at least, in some of these States, the population has naturally increased. Now you start Puerto Rico off at the same point as the other institutions.

Mr. CALDWELL. Of course, Puerto Rico was in the second Morrill Act, but not in the Bankhead-Jones Act. All I could say is that the pressure for higher education in Puerto Rico is very intense. The formula does not attempt to measure the relative intensity of need in this stage.

The CHAIRMAN. They received the first \$50,000 under the Morrill Act?

Mr. CALDWELL. It was \$20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether they received it under the first or the second Morrill Act, they received the benefit. But they do not receive benefits from the Bankhead-Jones Act?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is rather strange that we have been sitting here year after year and nobody has come forward in behalf of Puerto Rico until now.

Mr. CALDWELL. We have not been looking after them, I suppose, on that. They should have petitioned it for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. It does include them?

Mr. CALDWELL. Indeed, it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Maybe the need now is greater than in other places.

Mr. CALDWELL. As a matter of fact, I think that the committee would be interested to know that there has been recent legislation to place in Puerto Rico, in conjunction with the University of Puerto Rico, an atomic reactor, and training facilities, which it is hoped will become a leading training facility—not only for Puerto Rico and its budding scientists, but for Latin America.

So the University of Puerto Rico has not only status, but it has a tremendous mission to perform in that country. And the pressures of enrollment there are quite real.

Mr. HOEVEN. How about Hawaii and Alaska?

Mr. CALDWELL. Hawaii and Alaska are already included in the legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is the need in Alaska as great as in the State of Iowa?

Mr. CALDWELL. I simply do not know the intensity of the need. There are the relative needs.

As far as the flat grants are concerned, this is the way the legislation is already written. We are not changing any of that concept.

The CHAIRMAN. On the basis of population they will receive far less than Puerto Rico?

Mr. CALDWELL. I assume so, yes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Do I understand correctly then—of the \$9 million, approximately \$2 million is on the flat basis and the remaining \$7 million is on the population basis?

Mr. CALDWELL. No, sir. Of the increases proposed, the flat grants will total \$6,650,000 and the new money on the population basis will be \$2,798,000. So, of the increases proposed, it is roughly 2 to 1 between the flat grants and the population basis.

Mr. PIRNIE. One goes on the population basis and the other on the flat basis?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, Senator; one goes on the population base and the flat grants on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I think that I should let the record show that Chancellor Caldwell is a product of Mississippi State College of my State, and one of the prominent educators of our land, and of North Carolina State College.

The CHAIRMAN. You should not be embarrassed by telling us that. [Laughter.]

Mr. CALDWELL. I thank you, Mr. Abernethy.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it should, also, be noted on the record, that North Carolina has reciprocated the assistance that we have given it by sending one of its fine educators down to Mississippi State.

I would like to know, Dr. Caldwell, if you have brought with you a table showing the distribution of the current authorization and appropriation for this purpose, which will be distributed if this becomes law?

Mr. CALDWELL. In each State? No, we have not brought that with us. We will be very pleased to supply that to the committee. And if the chairman is setting a second hearing, we could present it then.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think that we ought to have it. I am not too much impressed with the distribution of funds which go for a specific purpose on the basis of population, because the population actually does not relate, necessarily to that which is in these institutions.

Mr. Albert of Oklahoma raised a very important question in my judgment, that although the population of Oklahoma has been rather stable in recent years, the enrollment at Oklahoma State University, the enrollment there has so enlarged, so that if the funds are distributed on the basis of population of the States, even though Oklahoma State University has doubled in population in its enrollments, I do not understand why they have not lost money under this act, due to the fact that the State has not increased.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Abernethy, the fact is that percentagewise, they have, undoubtedly, just as the representation in Congress has been shifting with these shifting population increases, but under this proposal, they would not get any less.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is not necessarily to benefit the population in direct benefits to the populations. The funds are to be used among the students, it is for their benefit, and for the land-grant colleges where they are enrolled.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That, obviously, is what it is for.

I would like to see those figures.

Mr. CALDWELL. We will, certainly, furnish you with a table that will be an approximation of these figures.

Let me say again that we have not attempted to challenge the basis on which these funds were distributed as of 1935 in the Act.

(The information referred to above may be found in the tables on pp. 70-71.)

Mr. ALBERT. Will you yield while I yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. First of all, under this formula, on the basis of inflationary increase, every college will get an increase in funds?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALBERT. Regardless of whether the State has gained or lost in population?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALBERT. Secondly, in addition to furnishing us with a breakdown of the distribution among the colleges and universities, could you give us a breakdown of what the difference would be if the increases were made on the basis of the student population, rather than on the basis of the State's population?

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the student population in the colleges, do you not?

Mr. CALDWELL. The enrollment in the colleges themselves?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, sir. Would that be a difficult thing to do?

Mr. CALDWELL. No. We can get the figures on the enrollments from the Office of Education and we can make an approximation. It would not be an official interpretation.

Mr. ALBERT. It may be that a combination of the two would provide an index of this student enrollment factor.

(The information referred to above may be found in tables on pp. 81-82.)

The CHAIRMAN. Will you yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, that might be worth considering.

The CHAIRMAN. There are two factors.

It seems to me that the first factor would be the student population in the land-grant colleges, because that does put it on the basis of need, without regard to the general population in any particular State. I know you have indicated that you did not want to disturb the formula in the Morrill Act, but you want to amend the Bankhead-Jones Act. If we amend it, why could we not authorize this distribution on the basis of the student population in the land-grant college? I believe that would be literally justified.

Mr. CALDWELL. I did not know whether this would be a practical disadvantage in doing it that way. I see the point thoroughly that you are trying to meet the needs, which is in terms of the enrollment, rather than what happened to be the fact with respect to the population of the State. I am sure that I would assume that the Congress was thinking of simplicity as it must think of its administration, to some extent, whereas we take a census every 10 years, and the new one is coming off right now which will determine the distribution by population and our enrollments are going to be shifting and changing every year from now on. It is of some help administratively within the institution to be able to anticipate the amount of money you are going to get. If any one institution would like to anticipate getting more for planning its budget for each succeeding biennium, it would be a little difficult to be relying upon a particular figure in 1961, and find out that it was going to be less in the distribution in 1953.

I still think that your point, which is the basis of the discussion, is quite valid.

The CHAIRMAN. You would have the outright grants?

Mr. CALDWELL. The flat grants.

The CHAIRMAN. The flat grants?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, and the other would be the variable.

The CHAIRMAN. You would vary it as the population increased or changed.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the question of enrollment come into it at all?

Mr. CALDWELL. Not at all.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The enrollment factor would raise a question, would it not and—we use a lot of figures that so many have been enrolled on a certain day at Mississippi State, at the university, at Mississippi Southern and so on.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is exactly it. It becomes a very complicated thing.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Some of them may be mail-order students.

Mr. CALDWELL. Who are the full-time equivalent of enrollees in the institution.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is the enrollment at North Carolina State?

Mr. CALDWELL. It is 6,200 as of September last year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What was it 25 years ago?

Mr. CALDWELL. Twenty-five years ago, it was probably, 1,200.

It was that probably, 25 years ago.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That has been an increase of about 500 percent. The State has, certainly, not increased that much in population.

Mr. CALDWELL. No.

Mr. DIXON. Will you yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. May I ask what the enrollment might be in 1970, just to show how far we are going?

Mr. CALDWELL. We estimate that the enrollment provided North Carolina State College shares its percentage in the enrollment of the public colleges and universities, as it does today, that the enrollment will be somewhere between 12,000 and 14,000. It will be double what it is today.

Mr. DIXON. It will be double by that time?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. That is why I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is an understatement that the request is "a modest one." It is not enough.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with you. When Dr. Caldwell first brought the matter to me, it impressed me very much. I appreciate your making this modest approach; however, that should not prevent you or your organization from coming back again at a later date with something else, if you find in the meantime it is more advisable.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. In that connection, I notice, Dr. Caldwell, you are now only receiving \$5 million of these funds?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Could you give me just a guess as to what percentage that might be of the total cost that you have in this great program?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Andre is the dean of the School of Agriculture at Iowa State College who will have some figures on this and will answer your question, Mr. Matthews. Let me not anticipate his testimony.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I will be delighted to wait for him.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to call Dr. Andre right now.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Just one more question. I do not know whether Dr. Caldwell would like to make an observation about this—it is not in line with your particular testimony which I have enjoyed very much, and have been very enthusiastic about your suggestions in your program. At the University of Florida, some of our people in our graduate schools have been concerned about the method by which these graduate scholarships are awarded under the National Defense Education Act. Their feeling is that these scholarships should be awarded pretty much on the basis of the merit of the existing graduation programs.

As I understand, the first year, during the operation of the act, the institution had to present a scholarship program, sometimes one that would be absolutely new, and that instead of the scholarships being awarded on the basis of what you might call areas, they were awarded on the basis of this new method of presenting a program that is entirely new and something that is entirely different.

As I say, I know that is entirely off of the subject that you came here to testify about, but I wonder if you would like to make an observation about it.

Mr. CALDWELL. You will find a difference of opinion on this point, to begin with, on the basis on which money of this sort should be distributed, but it was clearly one of the objectives of the act, and those administering the National Defense Education Act with respect to this particular title, that is, the distribution of funds for graduate fellowships, to strengthen some of the graduate schools in institutions that do not now get the bulk of the graduate students.

What we have found in too many programs in the country, not Federal programs, particularly, but foundation grants, et cetera, to those who have shall be given, and there has been a constant, almost an overstrengthening—not that, precisely—an oversupply of fellowships in some of the stronger institutions, whereas other institutions which were almost as good and which were right ready for some expansion, and to move up into the top ranks and needed a little additional help, in the way of fellowships, for example, to come to them.

So I think that you would find a rather strong general opinion that the present pattern is good and not bad.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Caldwell, I assume that agriculture and engineering both are taught in all of these land-grant colleges?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir; every one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you about something else.

Has there not been a lot of rivalry between the land-grant colleges and other universities and colleges with regard to teaching certain subjects? Have not some of these colleges gone far afield and tried to add certain subjects to their curriculums not originally intended? You mentioned something about dentistry. How could they become involved in agricultural engineering? The first thing you know it will be law, and so forth.

Mr. CALDWELL. There are several things on this. Let me try to make it short by saying that in a number of the States, about one-half, roughly, the land-grant colleges were established as separate institutions, separate from the State universities, but in about one-half of them they are combined.

For example, at the University of Illinois, that is the land-grant State University of the State of Illinois.

In Oklahoma, however, you have the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University, the latter being the land-grant institution.

In Mississippi you have the University of Mississippi and Mississippi State University. That was originally the A. & M. College, and is now Mississippi State, which is the land-grant college.

In the comprehensive State land-grant college you have medicine and law and dentistry and everything else, too. That is probably what you have in mind.

Take North Carolina State College, which institution is technological entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. You would not want dental students or law students, would you?

Mr. CALDWELL. It would be foolish for us. It is foolish for States to duplicate certain programs in terms of the need.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. PIRNIE. Is it not true that the present land-grant college is carrying other subjects which are sharply different from the land-grant college curriculums? I am thinking in terms of Cornell University, for example.

Mr. CALDWELL. Cornell is a combined private and public institution.

Mr. PIRNIE. The land-grant phase is not confused with the other operation, is it?

Mr. CALDWELL. The best way to answer your question is to say that at the professional level of the law schools, and the schools of dentistry and of medicine, they are always on separate budgets in every institution. There is an identified budget for each one of these professional schools.

At the undergraduate level, the freshmen and sophomores for example, you do not know what they are going to be—which one of these channels they will take for their advanced and professional work.

So in your classes in mathematics, you will include all students. And in your classes in chemistry it will include all of your students. Such would also be true of physics.

I am quite certain that different institutions have different ways of handling their students from the freshman and sophomore level to the junior and senior level. There are different ways of organizing their different colleges as concerning their professional staffs, but the land-grant college, for instructional purposes, very generally speaking, come into the undergraduate budget in support of the basic sciences, such as mathematics and engineering.

Mr. PIRNIE. That is the point that I wanted to make, that there had been such a segregation of funds.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. PIRNIE. So that the original concept of the act is pretty generally being carried out.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would just like to say that you have presented a very fine statement on this subject.

Great progress was made at the University of Arkansas under your able leadership, and we disliked so much that you saw fit to go to a

larger institution. I am sure that if you had remained at the University of Arkansas it would grow to be almost as large as the one you now serve.

Mr. CALDWELL. You are very kind, Mr. Gathings.

Mr. GATHINGS. You state that there has been no additional authorization made to this act for 25 years. I wonder why something has not been done prior to this time—why the effort has not been made to increase it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I am afraid that I cannot take credit for generating this idea. I cannot tell you why it has not been made. There was a stretch between 1910 and 1935 when nothing was done. So taking it on the basis of 25-year steps, we are on schedule.

The CHAIRMAN. The fact that you came here from North Carolina and your colleague came here from Iowa was just coincidental, was it not?

Mr. CALDWELL. Just coincidental. [Laughter.]

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to know whether or not you have any figures on what percentage of the teacher's salary in the land-grant college is now paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have no such total. Again, the testimony that Mr. Andre will bring to you will indicate what the total is at Iowa State University. I must say that this would be or could be a fairly valid picture for most of the institutions.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. What would that be?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Andre can give you that information.

The CHAIRMAN. I will recognize Dr. Andre now.

First, Mr. Hoeven would like to make some remarks.

Mr. HOEVEN. I take a great deal of pride in presenting to you Dr. Floyd Andre of the College of Agriculture of Iowa State University.

Dr. Andre is well known in agricultural circles. He is one of the leading agricultural authorities in the United States today.

I am very happy to have you here, Dr. Andre.

The CHAIRMAN. We will very glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF DEAN FLOYD ANDRE, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. ANDRE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, what I would like to do is to give you an example or two of what has happened in Iowa from 1935 and again in 1960.

In 1935 in Iowa, the State of Iowa contributed to Iowa State College, which is now the State university, \$2,175,000, at which time we had 4,412 students at Iowa State.

This year the State of Iowa is contributing \$11,500,00 for 9,252 students; in other words, our student population has doubled since 1935 at Iowa State, and the State support has increased almost sixfold.

Now, with reference to the second Morrill funds, in 1935, these Federal funds which Dr. Caldwell has referred to, amounted to 4.8 percent. This year they will amount to 1.1 percent.

As to these funds which are being discussed this morning, in 1935, to show you that the State has kept up with this, Iowa's contribution for teaching was 72 percent of the teaching budget, and the remainder coming from fees, from these Federal funds, and from other sources.

This year, 1960, the State of Iowa's contribution is 73 percent. In other words, it is the same, you might say, in those 25 years.

So, therefore, these funds are very important to us, because, at least, they would help bring in line the Federal funds with the State funds.

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I understand it, sir, insofar as these Morrill Act funds are concerned, you get just a little over 1 percent of your total from them?

Mr. ANDRE. 1.1 percent.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think that is the important figure to emphasize.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is not quite clear to me who makes up the difference. I understood you to say that the State of Iowa pays about 73 percent.

Mr. ANDRE. We charge registration fees. And then there are funds we get where people leave us land, or leave us money. And then interest comes in. We have that.

Mr. POAGE (presiding). I do not want to criticize the practice of any of the various institutions, but you just pointed out that Iowa State carries many of these same courses as the university. A great many of the colleges are doing that. Some of the A. & M. colleges are doing that.

It seems to me that has a great deal of significance. You are doing everything that the State university is doing—are you not running in competition with them?

Mr. ANDRE. I will talk about Iowa, because I know that.

Mr. POAGE. You can talk about Iowa. I know that it is happening in many other States, too.

Mr. ANDRE. Actually, I think that there are only about three land-grant institutions left that have not changed their name to university.

So far as Iowa State is concerned, we do not expect to go into medicine. We do not expect to go into law. They, certainly, should be at the university.

Mr. POAGE. You are teaching English, are you not?

Mr. ANDRE. Yes, sir. We have an English department.

Mr. POAGE. And you have all of the social sciences that the university has, do you not?

Mr. ANDRE. No, sir; we do not have graduate programs in English or in history.

Mr. POAGE. You do not?

Mr. ANDRE. Or in languages—no, sir, nor in political science. And we do not expect to have, because the State of Iowa cannot afford to have two institutions duplicating programs in that way.

However, there are certain programs that do duplicate each other. Some of them may be for the public good.

Iowa State University does teach engineering, and has about 500 students. We have about 3,300 students in engineering.

They have a small department of home economics, and we have a very large department of home economics. But this name "university," I would suppose was from pressure from people out in the State to change the name, rather than pressure from the staff members, largely because these people were doing more traveling to Europe, and in Europe if you say that you are from a college, why, they look down on it for some reason.

And one of the people who pushed that very hard was Mrs. Raymond Thayer, who is a graduate of Simpson's College, and she would even say Simpson University.

Mr. DIXON. A college does not have the status of a university. In some ways, the term "college" is a misnomer.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Am I right or wrong that there is an institution across the river from Boston that is called a college, or have they changed it to university?

Mr. QUIE. I understand, Dr. Caldwell, that you represent not only the land-grant universities, but the State universities as well. Do they not need help as much as the land-grant colleges?

Mr. CALDWELL. I think they do, as a matter of fact, but you have to start fresh on legislation to accomplish that. The land-grant institution is in the position of their arms around us, and we with our arms around them. We do not want to deny participation in any program of Federal aid to higher education. We would encourage it, as a matter of fact. We stand shoulder to shoulder with them on that.

We go back to a position in our institutions as they were inaugurated by Federal action and which have been supported in the past by explicit actions of the Congress of the United States, and we are trying to bring that up to date.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Will you yield in that connection?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to point out that I know we all recognize there are many programs that universities participate in. There is the GI bill of rights, where they pay the fees, when they go into the institutions, and there is the dormitory loan program, where they borrow money for that purpose.

I am opposed to a general Federal aid to education bill for public school construction, but I am all for this proposed measure.

Mr. QUIE. It does seem to me that we are trying to expand the Federal Government into higher education. And it does seem to me that we ought to give the support to all areas of higher education, rather than to a specific area.

Do you think that it is a wise proposal to change the provision governing the amount that each land-grant college gets, to a proportion of their increased enrollment? Would there not be a tendency in the situation where the land-grant college and the State university are one to make certain that all of these students went through some courses in the land-grant college, so that they could all be called students in the land-grant college, and thereby get more Federal funds?

Mr. CALDWELL. I must add that there would be more complications than we can see in this very quick analysis of an enrollment formula. We would not, in the first place, advocate that you count the enrollment in English and physics and mathematics as a method of determining it. This is one factor that does not measure into simple numbers of students.

Here is an enrollment that at one institution has 6,000 students, we will say, with 1,000 graduate students, among those 6,000 students. And here is another institution with 6,000 students that has maybe 200 graduate students in the 6,000 students.

The costs involved in the first institution obviously are very much greater than they are in the second institution. It probably costs at least six times plus student credit hours or more to operate and train and educate students at the graduate level than it does in the freshman and sophomore years, for example.

So these formulas can be oversimplified in terms of enrollment and not actually measure the need as much as we think they might sometimes.

On this question that you have reopened, may I add what we are proposing here on the increase of the flat grants, which is the heaviest portion of this money, it would protect the States against, for example, in Oklahoma where they have been hurt, where they have a diminishing population but an increase in enrollment at the land-grant college, and the heavier portion of this being lodged in the flat grant sum, which would protect that institution against the population formula, to some extent.

I do not quite know how to handle the enrollment formula. I think that we are playing with something that is very difficult to apply when we get into the enrollment program.

Mr. QUIE. What percentage of the cost of the salaries were financed with Federal appropriations—how much would that 1.1 percent be increased, if we passed this bill?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not know what the Federal share would be proportionately. The flat grants to each State would be increased by \$130,000, and then another \$2,500,000 would be distributed on the basis of population. I do not know what that would amount to in the State of Iowa.

Mr. ANDRE. It would bring it up to around 4 percent, just as a rough estimate.

Mr. PIRNIE. I want to bring your attention to the military training aspect, because I believe that it is true that that is one phase of our program that is producing officer material on the basis that the Federal Government can use that at the lowest possible unit cost; is that correct?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir; it is.

Mr. PIRNIE. And that continues to function very effectively. I think that we ought to keep that in mind as being one of the basic intents of the land-grant institutions.

Mr. McINTIRE. You referred to the period from 1935 to 1959. I know that the tuition fees in the land-grant colleges have gone up, but by how much?

Mr. ANDRE. I can give it to you again from the standpoint of Iowa State. We are on a quarter system, with three quarters a year, 12 weeks per quarter.

In 1945 our regular registration fee was \$14 a quarter, and three times \$14 for the 9 months. And now it is \$71 a quarter.

Mr. McINTIRE. Does the State of Iowa rate among the lower ones?

Mr. ANDRE. I would say that we are low. The highest one in the Big Eight at the present time, as I recall, but we are low compared to some of the more expensive schools, such as the University of Wisconsin, for instance, or the University of Minnesota, and some of the others.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Dr. Caldwell, this question comes to mind.

Was it the intention of the act that the funds allocated under this be used in the subjects related to agriculture?

Mr. CALDWELL. And the mechanical arts, and subjects related thereto, that is the language of the act.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In the handling of the funds at this college level, are those funds used for all purposes in the colleges—in the land-grant colleges—are those funds earmarked for agriculture, primarily, in these institutions?

Mr. CALDWELL. No, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does it go through any general formula and is it distributed for all purposes in such proportion and percentages as are provided?

Mr. CALDWELL. The accounting procedures may differ from one institution to another, but I think that I can describe what is typical.

To some extent, these particular funds become indistinguishable from other salary funds available to the institutions at the undergraduate level. But the people who are running that, the budget offices, who are allocating the funds to the various expenditures of the institutions, make certain that these expenditures are placed in those departments which are engineering, agriculture or related thereto.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is the budget at North Carolina?

Mr. CALDWELL. The total budget is nearly \$20 million.

Again you get into semantic problems. The total budget includes all of the auxiliary activities. The State appropriation to the college comes to nearly \$10 million.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And what amount comes to it from the Morrill Act.

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, \$94,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. A little less than 1 percent.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. While you say that it is enough to be welcome and appreciated, it is still not a substantial figure.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is right, just as \$130,000 does not look like much, but if I had \$130,000 additional to spend the second year of this biennium, for example, in the budget of North Carolina State College, I could give 130 faculty members a \$1,000 raise.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is all, thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you gentlemen very much.

Are there any further questions?

Mr. CALDWELL. Thank you.

Mr. ANDRE. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Dean Floyd Andre, follows:)

STATEMENT OF DEAN FLOYD ANDRE

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Floyd Andre, dean of agriculture at Iowa State University of Science and Technology at Ames, Iowa.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee on behalf of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in support of H.R. 10876.

II. BACKGROUND

This bill as introduced into the House of Representatives on March 3, 1960, by Congressman Harold Cooley would amend section 22 of the Bankhead-Jones

Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the appropriations to the land-grant colleges and universities for resident teaching.

The second Morrill Act and the amendment to it (1890, 1907) and the Bankhead-Jones Act (1935) now provide a total of \$5,051,500 in direct annual grants to the land-grant colleges and universities solely for instructional purposes. These resident teaching grants to the land-grant institutions are distributed in two ways.

1. A flat, equal amount to each institution.
2. Another portion on the basis of population.

III. REASONS FOR REQUESTING INCREASE IN AID

The last of these grants (the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935) was enacted 25 years ago. The grants have continued at the same level since. Surely this fact in itself is reason for a fresh examination of the aid level in 1960.

However, there are four other relevant reasons for requesting an increase.

1. Since 1935, the Nation's population has grown from about 127 million to the present 180 million. In other words, the population has expanded 42 percent.
2. Costs of teaching have increased greatly since 1935. States have appropriated more funds to the land-grant colleges to help offset these increased costs and larger enrollments. At Iowa State in 1935, for example, in Iowa there was available \$2,175,874 toward the operation of the institution, at which time our enrollment was 4,412 students.

This year the State appropriation is \$11,553,000, and the enrollment is 9,252. Whereas the enrollment has slightly more than doubled, State support has increased sixfold.

Likewise, one can compare the percentage contributed by the State toward instructional work in 1935 which was \$1,555,400 out of a total of \$2,175,874, or 72 percent. In 1935, the Federal aid to teaching at Iowa State was \$105,622 (including Smith-Hughes) or 4.8 percent of the total. This year 1960, out of a total of \$11,179,196 the State appropriated \$8,175,821, or 73 percent; whereas only 1.1 percent came from Federal funds.

3. Resident enrollments in land-grant colleges and universities increased from about 190,000 in 1936 to about 650,000 currently. Graduate enrollment in these institutions increased from about 15,000 to about 75,000 during the same period. In other words, enrollment in the land-grant colleges and universities has more than tripled since 1935. Graduate enrollment has increased about fivefold.

4. Not only do we have this mushrooming enrollment, but in the last few years, as you are all well aware I am sure, we have seen develop a keener and more intense interest in the quality of education. People are becoming more and more aware of the tremendous power of education in the race for survival. We should be grateful for this renewed interest in education and for the realization that we must be able to meet the demands of our changing world in our educational institutions to insure survival. The dimensions of our educational task today are great.

IV. EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The increase proposed for resident instruction in House bill H.R. 10876 is based only upon the inflation factor and the population factor. The amounts of the 1935 formula would be increased by 100 percent on account of inflation and 40 percent on account of population growth. Such an increase would be distributed according to the statutory formula. An analysis of the computations used to arrive at the amounts proposed in the bill is as follows:

1. The present total of flat grants to each State is \$70,000, which includes \$50,000 each under Morrill-Nelson and \$20,000 each under Bankhead-Jones. (Puerto Rico is omitted under the latter act.) The proposal is to increase the total for each State by \$130,000 and also to bring Puerto Rico into the Bankhead-Jones Act. Thus, the authorization for flat, equal grants would be increased from \$1 million under Bankhead-Jones to a total of \$7,650,000, which total would include Puerto Rico. The amount of increase is \$6,650,000, which is \$130,000 times 51 plus \$20,000 (to remedy Puerto Rico's position in Bankhead-Jones).

2. The present total of grants distributed on the basis of population is \$1,501,500. An increase in this amount by 100 percent plus 40 percent would bring this total to \$4,204,200, which we would round out to \$4,300,000, representing an increase of \$2,798,500.

3. Thus, the total appropriations would be as follows :

From Morrill Act.....	\$2, 550, 000
From Bankhead-Jones :	
Present.....	2, 501, 500
Increases proposed :	
Flat grants.....	2, 798,500
Population basis.....	6, 650,000
Subtotal.....	9, 448, 500
Grand total.....	14, 500, 000

V. CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I should like to underline the reasons why I believe this adjustment in appropriation for resident teaching should be adopted.

1. The grant has not been changed during the last 25 years.
2. During this period the Nation's population has expanded by 42 percent.
3. The 100 percent inflation which has occurred in the last 25 years has greatly diminished the real worth of the grant.
4. The land-grant institutions are tremendously hard-pressed in maintaining first-class teaching faculties in the face of much higher salaries offered by industry.
5. Student enrollment in land-grant institutions is more than three times greater than in 1935, and still greater increases are in the immediate offing.
6. In our struggle for national survival, our Nation can find no wiser investment than to support high quality instruction in its institutions of higher learning.

May I again express my deep appreciation, Mr. Chairman, to you and to this committee, for your graciousness in permitting me to testify in support of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We will next hear from Mr. Johnson, of the National Farmers Union.

We are very glad to have you with us, Mr. Johnson. You may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am Reuben Johnson of the National Farmers Union. I come before the committee as a very humble witness following two distinguished administrators of land-grant institutions. I have a brief page and a half statement which I would like to present as you see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you read your prepared statement.

STATEMENT OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, PRESENTED BY REUBEN R. JOHNSON, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

H.R. 10876 and similar bills afford the opportunity to give Federal help for the support of basic fundamental science and its applications in agriculture, engineering, and veterinary medicine at a time when it is badly needed to upgrade and augment teaching staffs of our land-grant colleges and universities.

Since 1890, the Congress has appropriated annually funds for instruction in land-grant institutions to supplement the endowment provided by the Morrill Act of 1862. These funds have not been increased since 1935. The annual appropriation totals \$5,501,500, distributed partly on a flat amount per State and partly on the basis of total population.

There has been a 40 percent increase in population since 1935 and the general level of prices has approximately doubled. As we understand it, the proposal is to increase the grants for teaching by applying factors representing the population increase, and the increase in prices. This would result in an increase of about \$9.5 millions. If the increase in student enrollment were used instead, the increase would be nearer \$30 million.

The land-grant institutions supply a high percentage of the trained people for all our agricultural activities: research personnel, soil conservation technicians, vocational agriculture teachers, extension agents and the veterinarians who do so much both in the field of animal health and human health.

Farm families continue to rely heavily on land-grant colleges and universities for information through trained personnel referred to above and also for educating farm youth in these and other occupational pursuits.

From such institutions come a high percentage of our best trained mathematicians, chemists, physicists, and engineers; our experts in plant culture and plant diseases; entomologists, bacteriologists. They train a high percentage of the future teachers in both our high schools and colleges, and many for elementary education as well. They supply about a third of the Regular and Reserve officers for our armed services.

You all know of the great increase in all these activities which use the graduates of the land-grant institutions in the past 25 years. Federal support of and demand for research in science and engineering, in human and animal health and in conservation has multiplied at least a hundredfold in the past 25 years. Yet nothing has been done by the National Government to help pay the cost of educating the people who perform these services on which we as a nation depend so heavily.

In the next 10 years college enrollments are expected to double. This is because we have many more young people in proportion to our total population than we used to have, and because advanced education is more essential for many careers than it used to be. The land-grant institutions, as public universities, will be expected to care for a substantial proportion of that increase. Their graduate schools, which have grown about 500 percent since 1935, now train 40 percent of all people at the highest level. The increase in teaching funds called for in these bills represents only a small fraction of the total which will be required. But it will represent at least \$100,000 to the land-grant institutions of each State, plus an additional sum based on population. This represents a relatively small amount but it may make the difference between keeping many highly qualified men and women in college teaching and having them seek more remunerative employment.

We appreciate the opportunity to present the views of National Farmers Union, Mr. Chairman, and we urge you to approve H.R. 10876.

The CHAIRMAN. We certainly thank you very much, Mr. Johnson, for your interest and for your appearance here.

Mr. GATHINGS. There is one point in connection with the next to the last paragraph of your statement, where you state—

the increase in teaching funds called for in these bills represent only a small fraction of the total which will be required. But it will represent at least \$100,000 to the land-grant institutions of each State, plus an additional sum based on population. This represents a relatively small amount, but it may make the difference between keeping many highly qualified men and women in college teaching and having them seek more remunerative employment.

That is a very good thought in my judgment. I just wondered whether Dr. Caldwell could elaborate a little more on that feature at this point.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Gathings, the teaching profession has from the cradles to the grave, that is from the primary grades right on through to the graduate school, before the task of attracting into its ranks and holding in its ranks—those are two problems that we have—first-class people. And there is not any question but what salary is a big factor in the problem.

We can establish fine conditions of work and all of the atmosphere and get good facilities here and yonder, but we still have to have the salaries. And there is no question in my mind or in those of my colleagues, but that the profession must share more—I would not say equitably, but more impressively in the total wealth of this country if higher education is to have the strength that the country expects of it.

Mr. GATHINGS. It seems to me to be very significant, that in order to have a higher type personnel, we will have to pay for them.

Mr. CALDWELL. The Ford Foundation study of 3 years ago compared salaries of the administrators and professors and associate professors and so on in the colleges, from 1904 to 1954, and showed how relatively and absolutely in terms of purchasing power the teaching profession is slipping in this country. We do not think that the Nation can afford to let that continue.

Mr. GATHINGS. Particularly in a field like this.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GATHINGS. It would be very necessary here.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we thank you very much, Mr. Johnson. And we again thank the other two gentlemen.

The committee will now stand adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee was adjourned.)

INCREASED FUNDS FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1960

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., in room 1310, New House Office Building, Hon. Harold D. Cooley (chairman) presiding.

Present: Representatives Cooley, Poage, Grant, Gathings, Albert, Abbitt, Thompson, Jones of Missouri, Johnson of Wisconsin, Coad, Breeding, Stubblefield, McSween, Hogan, Levering, Hoeven, Dague, McIntire, Dixon, Teague of California, Quie, Short, Pirnie, and Latta.

Also present: Christine S. Gallagher, clerk; Hyde H. Murray, assistant clerk; and Francis M. LeMay, consultant.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will please be in order.

Do you desire to make a statement, Mr. Monagan? If so, please come forward.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FIFTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my support of H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974. And I would like permission of the committee to file a statement for the record at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, you may file your statement. We have been glad to have you appear here.

Mr. MONAGAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Hon. John S. Monagan follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, FIFTH DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I support H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974.

These bills provide for grants to land-grant institutions of learning.

The last appropriated grants to land-grant institutions were established 24 years ago. It needs no extended demonstration to prove that the levels of aid established in 1935 are completely inadequate today.

The change in population, the depreciation of the dollar, and all the other economic charges which have taken place since the midthirties have been met in many fields, but in this vital section of education, we are still back in the midst of the depression.

Our society is daily making greater demands on our educational system. We are requiring more college graduates. We are upgrading many jobs to require higher degrees and we are increasing the number of jobs with these requirements.

One of the areas most frequently cited as the most critical in our struggle with the Communist system is that of education. Surely we must leave no stone unturned in our efforts to strengthen and improve our system and I submit that adjusting our grants to land-grant institutions to conform to realistic modern standards as proposed by these bills provides a possible and necessary step.

President A. N. Jorgensen of the University of Connecticut has communicated with me about these bills and he strongly supports them and urges their adoption.

I am happy to support them, too, and I urge the committee to take favorable action upon them.

The CHAIRMAN. And without objection, the several letters that we have received from a number of leading universities will be inserted into the record at this point.

(The letters received from the University of Kentucky, University of Tennessee, Michigan State University, University of Rhode Island, University of Connecticut, Purdue University, University of Arkansas, Clemson College, Mississippi State University, University of Wisconsin, Washington State University, University of New Hampshire, University of Arizona, University of Missouri, North Dakota Agricultural College, Virginia State College, Auburn University, University of Vermont, University of Nevada, University of Illinois, University of Maine, University of Massachusetts, Oklahoma State University, and the University of Nebraska follow:)

VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE,
Petersburg, Va., May 18, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: This letter is sent to request you to add my name to the list of persons endorsing bills H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 before Congress to authorize an increase in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

The fact that the land-grant colleges have not had any increase in fund under the Second Morrill Act since 1935 would indicate definitely that in order to maintain the proper standards in this important phase of the instructional program at our colleges, increased funds are imperative.

As a land-grant institution, Virginia State College is in full support of the statement made before the committee by Dr. John Caldwell on May 16, 1960.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. DANIEL, *President.*

AUBURN UNIVERSITY,
Auburn, Ala., May 18, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: In behalf of Auburn University I am writing to endorse the proposal to increase the appropriations for instruction in the land-grant colleges and universities as set out in your H.R. 10876.

The reasons are evident, and the arguments presented to your committee by Chancellor Caldwell and Dean Andre on May 16 are cogent and reflect the general situation in these institutions. The instructional load in the land-grant colleges and universities have outgrown support for instructional purposes, and the continuing devaluation of the dollar has further handicapped efforts to cope with the problem.

I think you may be interested in the following figures from the official records of Auburn University:

1. In the scholastic year 1934-35, when the Bankhead-Jones Act became law, the enrollment was 1,912.
2. In the scholastic year 1958-59 the enrollment was 10,887.

Thus in 25 years since the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, the enrollment has increased to a total of approximately 5.7 times the enrollment of 1934-35.

In the course of those years the purchasing power of the dollar has declined and the costs of instruction have steadily risen.

Further, the nature and purposes of these colleges and universities place a heavy premium upon the teaching of the basic sciences. Inasmuch as we are living in an age of scientific revolution in which the acceleration of change is so great that we are pressed to keep our instruction abreast of the rapidly growing body of knowledge, the business of providing adequate and proper instruction presents a continuing and critical problem.

This, I think, is a problem which is directly in the field of the national interest and merits the serious consideration of the Congress.

I, therefore, on behalf of Auburn University, respectfully urge your serious consideration and support of H.R. 10876.

Most sincerely,

RALPH B. DRAUGHON, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
Columbia, May 19, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*House of Representatives,
Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: In response to Miss Gallagher's suggestion for an opinion on H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, I want to urge strongly the committee's approval of this appropriation along the lines of President John T. Caldwell's testimony. The costs of all instruction here in land-grant colleges has been increased very substantially. All of this increase since 1935 has been borne by the student through increased fees or by the governments of the States, whose appropriations have increased manyfold. It seems only reasonable and fair that the Federal Government's contribution should bear a closer relationship to present costs and thus enable these State universities to meet more adequately the increasing costs.

It seems to me too that the National Government's support of land-grant college education is traditional and has general approval and there can be no objection to it on principle from any quarter. Certainly, the need for scientists and other research people can be met in part through this means of Federal aid more rapidly than any other at the present time. I urge as strongly as I can that the proposal be supported by the committee.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER ELLIS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,
Burlington, Vt., May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: The substance of the two bills H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 have my complete endorsement and support. The presentation made to your committee by Dr. John Caldwell correctly points to the increased services, the increased costs and the increased needs that are being experienced by the land-grant colleges throughout the country.

In addition to these pertinent arguments, I believe there is an additional aspect that should be stressed. The shifting emphases in the curriculums in the colleges of agriculture have once again made necessary considerable amounts of study and additions to the resident-instructional program. Every educational institution undergoes a gradual evolution. From time to time there occurs a more radical need for change to meet new conditions. This situation exists now.

Earlier changes from the practicing agriculturalist to the agricultural businessman and the agricultural engineer have already become established and are well known. Now we must meet a still broader and more far-reaching change.

the production of the international agriculturalist and the agriculturalist engaged in the sociological and political aspects of the domestic and international picture. Preparing for this changing emphasis is a costly procedure, but preparations must be made early and promptly if we are to have the trained personnel available to supply these new roles.

Passage of the proposed legislation will in some measure reimburse the land-grant colleges for the funds that are already being used to fulfill these obligations.

This relatively unrestricted appropriation to the instructional funds of the university is a most appropriate type of assistance from the Federal Government to the land-grant colleges. We shall all be grateful to you for making this aid available to carry out this educational commitment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. FEY, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
Reno, May 18, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
Chairman, House Agriculture Committee,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: The University of Nevada strongly supports H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, the land-grant teaching fund bills, on which we understand you plan to conduct hearings on Tuesday, May 24, 1960.

In view of the fact that the Bankhead-Jones Act, which was the latest to provide for direct annual grants to the land-grant colleges and universities for instructional purposes, was approved 24 years ago, we believe it is essential that the underlying philosophy of this kind of support be reexamined in the light of conditions as of today. Inflation has increased cost by 100 percent since 1935 and the population of the United States has increased 40 percent during this period. This is particularly true of the State of Nevada, which is still the fastest growing State in the Union and in which it is estimated by the Bureau of the Census that the population increase during the past 10 years will approximate 75 percent.

With the heavily increased demands upon the University of Nevada, particularly its college of agriculture, for increased instruction in a wide variety of fields, we believe it is essential that this legislation be approved, not only for the welfare of the country as a whole but particularly for our explosive population in Nevada.

What is actually requested in this legislation is not an increase of support but rather a bringing up to date, in terms of the 1960 population and purchasing power of the dollar, the basis of support established in 1935.

In the strongest possible terms we urge passage of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. ARMSTRONG, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, May 19, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee of Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I write to give my endorsement to the testimony presented to your committee by Chancellor John Caldwell with reference to H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 on the subject of increasing support by the Federal Government to land-grant colleges and State universities.

I understand from the clerk, Christine S. Gallagher, that hearings will be resumed on May 24. I would appreciate your receiving this letter as a part of the record of the hearings.

The Federal legislation now applicable to the land-grant colleges and State universities, both through the original land grants and the subsequent authorization for continuing appropriations, in effect marks these institutions as parts of a federally encouraged system of higher education. Obviously, their contributions to the national welfare justified these actions and it is only reasonable that the size of the appropriations should keep pace with the growth in the population and be accommodated to the inflation factor.

Even greater support than is proposed in these bills could be justified by the tremendous growth in the contributions of the land-grant colleges and State universities to the national defense, the public health, and the economic welfare of the Nation. A budget request based upon any measurement of these contributions to what are inherently the responsibilities of the Federal Government would far exceed the modest amount proposed in the bills before your committee.

In a sense, then, the bills before the committee may be seen as proposals for keeping faith with the tradition of Federal relationship to the land-grant colleges and State universities. The bills represent the minimum in bringing this relationship up to the trendlines of the past.

Although the amounts involved are not large in the measure of the total expenditures of the institutions concerned, all of the institutions are sufficiently hard pressed that the grants requested will be most meaningful in bringing strength and enrichment to the existing programs and to some needed new ones. Every institution has a wide gap between potential and fulfillment; between what it is able to do and what it feels it could do for the enlargement of its services and the increase in its effectiveness. Every State is pressed by the problem of new revenues, and the institutions of higher learning are confronted with demands far beyond their capacity. At this moment in the history of the land-grant colleges and State universities, every assistance from the Federal Government, whatever its size, will bring dividends in vitally needed service to the Nation.

Sincerely,

DAVID D. HENRY, *President.*

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE,
Orono, Maine, May 19, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: I should like to add my unqualified support to H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 now being considered by your committee. The financial help that would be provided by these bills is most timely to the University of Maine and I am convinced to the other land-grant institutions as well. I only hope the committee may find it possible to act favorably upon these bills.

Chancellor John T. Caldwell has pointed up the plight of the land-grant colleges and State universities very well in his testimony and I wish to reiterate the very great need for action at this time.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD H. ELLIOTT, *President.*

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Amherst, May 19, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: The University of Massachusetts recommends strongly that H.R. 10974 be supported. Our enrollment has increased tremendously since 1935 and at the same time admission requirements have shown a steady increase.

Enactment of H.R. 10974 would provide significant support for educational programs at the University of Massachusetts to meet the needs of the increasing college-age population in Massachusetts. Enactment of H.R. 10974 will help the University of Massachusetts to fulfill its role in solving the critical problems of providing higher education to our qualified youth in the agricultural and related scientific, technical and professional fields.

A recently completed staff study (January 1960) shows the discrepancy in 1967 between the need for additional places for resident students in Massachusetts and available facilities in 1967 constitutes a gap of about 20,000 students.

1967 college-age population in Massachusetts, 371,960

1. Expected resident enrollment (1 to 4-year institutions) in Massachusetts based upon the percentage going in 1958-59 (26 percent of 371,960)-----	96, 709
2. Enrollment of residents who will probably not be able to enroll in out-of-State institutions-----	6, 000
Total enrollment-----	102, 709
3. Places that were available in 1958-59 for residents in Massachusetts institutions-----	62, 220
4. Maximum increase now planned at all institutions for residents by 1967-----	20, 000
Total places in Massachusetts-----	82, 220
Massachusetts residents who will have no place to go-----	20, 489

This deficiency will certainly exceed the figure of 20,489 by 1975 unless more places are provided for college students from 1967 to 1975. If private institutions cannot absorb these numbers, and this is very likely, it is the responsibility of the land-grant university to provide educational opportunities for these thousands of qualified youths.

Sincerely yours,

SHANNON McCUNE, *Provost.*

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Stillwater, May 18, 1960.

Re H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, land-grant teaching funds bills.

Hon. HAROLD COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN COOLEY: I have been advised by Chancellor John T. Caldwell of North Carolina State College, and chairman of the association's legislative committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, that a second and final hearing before your honorable committee on the captioned House measures will be held on May 24.

I have examined these measures and read with interest the testimony offered by Chancellor Caldwell before your committee. I may say that he also advised me of the very friendly reception which he received for his cause and for his own appearance, which all of us charged with responsibility for administration in the land-grant colleges and universities deeply appreciate.

May I say that I concur in every respect with Chancellor Caldwell's testimony and respectfully add my voice in bespeaking the justification and even the urgent necessity for the additional teaching funds. We are all very much aware of the increased costs of services of all kinds in the past 25 years, and it seems to me most logical that the grant level in this field which has not been changed since 1935 should now be examined with a view to adjustment.

We earnestly petition that the committee may give these measures their favorable action and report.

Respectfully yours,

OLIVER S. WILLIAM, *President.*

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES,
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Lincoln, Nebr., May 19, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: We are most grateful to you for advising us concerning the hearings before your committee on H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974. I

am extremely sorry that a previous commitment makes it impossible for me to be present next Tuesday, May 24, to express in person my strong support for these two bills and the program that they will make possible.

I have had an opportunity to read and study Chancellor Caldwell's testimony of May 16. I believe his statement is an excellent one and correctly interprets the attitudes of the land-grant institutions throughout the country.

I shall not attempt to restate the points made by Chancellor Caldwell, but should like to emphasize with him that we feel that the request is a sound one, that it involves no change whatever in long-established principles of State and Federal relationships, and that it will provide financial assistance for our teaching programs at a most crucial time.

Our thanks to you, Congressman Cooley, for your continued interest in our land-grant institutions and to you and the members of your committee for your consideration of this proposed legislation. If any of us can be of further assistance to you, you have only to let us know.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD M. HARDIN, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Knoxville, May 21, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: Thank you for inviting me to submit a statement regarding H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974. Enclosed is a copy of my statement, and I am sending 40 additional copies to Mrs. Gallagher in case you desire extra copies for distribution to committee members.

Enclosed also is a copy of a letter which I have written to all members of the House of Representatives from Tennessee.

My statement expresses my gratitude to you for what you have done and are doing to strengthen the instructional programs of land-grant institutions. On behalf of the students, who would be the ultimate benefactors of this legislation, I want to thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. HOLT, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Knoxville, May 20, 1960.

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARLTON: Knowing that you take a personal interest in all Federal legislation which might affect the University of Tennessee, I want to call your attention to identical bills by Congressman Harold Cooley, of North Carolina, and Congressman Henry Dixon, of Utah, relative to an increase in resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions (H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974). We understand that the second and final hearing on these bills is scheduled for May 24, 1960.

As you know, today's dollar buys about half of what it could have bought in 1935. Today's population is 40 percent more than it was in 1935. To provide for these and other changing conditions during the past quarter century, Congress has appropriated unprecedented increases in allotments to virtually all federally supported programs; but not to land-grant institutions in support of resident teaching.

The identical bills by Congressman Cooley and Dixon provide a method of bringing the resident teaching appropriations closer to the 1960 level, replacing purchasing powers that have been dissolved by inflation and also allowing for the effects that population increases have had upon enrollment increases in land-grant institutions.

The 1935 act, by the way, was one which accomplished the same purpose: bringing Federal support of land-grant institutions up to date in accordance with the extent of support that the Federal Government had previously given to these institutions under terms of the Morrill Act.

Enactment of these bills would increase the University of Tennessee's federal appropriations for resident instruction at least \$130,000 annually. This increase is desperately needed by the institution in meeting the demands of increased enrollments.

Enclosed is a copy of a statement on these bills which I am submitting to the House Committee on Agriculture.

Your assistance in the passage of these bills is earnestly solicited.

With warmest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. D. HOLT, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Knoxville, May 20, 1960.

To : The Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives.

From : Andrew D. Holt, president, the University of Tennessee.

Subject : Statement on H.R. 10876 by Congressman Cooley, and H.R. 10974 by Congressman Dixon.

The University of Tennessee is one of the institutions which would receive additional Federal support with the passage of H.R. 10876 or H.R. 10974, identical bills authorizing an increase in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. The justification for the proposed increase to the University of Tennessee will apply to every land-grant institution in the Nation. Hence, I want to present some facts on the University of Tennessee which can be used as a case history in considering this legislation.

As a land-grant institution, operating under the terms of the first Morrill Act of 1862 and the second Morrill Act of 1890, the University of Tennessee offers courses in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and the subjects related thereto." These courses are in the broad fields of knowledge covered by the College of Agriculture, the College of Engineering, the College of Home Economics, and the College of Liberal Arts (and Sciences). Pursuant to the purpose of the Morrill Acts, which was to make a higher education available to greater numbers of American youth, the University of Tennessee has zealously kept the cost of a higher education within the bounds of the economic resources of the masses.

In addition to resident instruction, the University of Tennessee and other land-grant institutions have two other programs supported in part by the Federal Government. One is the Agricultural Extension Service; another, the agricultural experiment station. Both of these additional programs have served a vital role in the development of agriculture and industry in our Nation.

Now we come to the crucial question in our case history: How has the University of Tennessee fared as a Federal land-grant institution in the past quarter century?

In 1935-36 the university received \$559,522 in Federal appropriations for the Agricultural Extension Service. In 1959-60 these appropriations had been increased to \$1,934,544, part of this increase to allow for the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, another part to provide for the increase in the State's population, and still another part to permit expansions and improvements in the Agricultural Extension Service.

In 1935-36 the university received \$108,695 in Federal appropriations for the agricultural experiment station. In 1959-60 these appropriations had been increased to \$863,012, part of this increase to allow for the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, another part to provide for an increase in the State's population, and still another part to permit expansions and improvements in the agricultural experiment station.

In 1935-36 the university received \$53,200 in Federal appropriations for its resident instruction program. In 1959-60 the appropriations were \$85,327—

Far from enough to allow for a 50-percent drop in the purchasing power of the dollar since 1935;

Far from enough to provide for an enrollment which has increased from 5,498 to 15,519 students since 1935 and which is expected to increase another 100 percent during the next decade;

Far from enough to assist the institution in doubling its course offerings to meet the demands of enrollment increases and to keep pace with scientific and cultural advances of our civilization since 1935.

How has the University of Tennessee fared as a Federal land-grant institution in the past quarter century? In its extension and research activities, the university is proud to say that its growing needs have had the response of a growing Federal support over the entire period. But there has been a neglect of the growing needs of resident instruction—the institution's basic program, which was the primary interest of the Morrill Act creating land-grant institutions nearly a hundred years ago.

Congressman Cooley and Congressman Dixon, sponsors of H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, and every member of the House Committee on Agriculture will have our unqualified support and our everlasting gratitude for any efforts made to correct the inequity that exists in Federal support of the instructional programs of land-grant institutions.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
East Lansing, May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: Attached is a statement on H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 that were referred to in the letter of May 16 from Miss Gallagher.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a statement that I would like to have included in the testimony presented before your committee on these bills.

With kind personal regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. HANNAH, *President.*

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY JOHN A. HANNAH, PRESIDENT, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John A. Hannah and I am president of Michigan State University at East Lansing. I submit this statement in support of bills H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions by amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended June 12, 1952.

Expenditures for land-grant institutions have paid rich dividends to the United States. This system has played an extremely significant role in upgrading the dignity of the individual and in preventing class distinction in this country. It has provided an educational opportunity for many who otherwise would have been denied the privilege to develop their special talents and abilities to the fullest extent.

I point to two achievements of our country within the last century toward which the land-grant system has made substantial contributions.

We have attained spectacular material gains, a higher standard of living than man has ever known. These gains came within our grasp when the advantages of education were made available on the broadest possible scale. Thereby, we developed the native skills of the American people and made possible the miracles of invention and mass production that we enjoy today. The application of science to the art of agriculture has been an underlying factor in our industrial growth. As long as the great majority of our people had to be employed in the production of food and fiber, we could spare few hands for the mills and shops. A century ago, something like 85 out of every 100 workers were necessarily engaged in agriculture, leaving only 15 to do the rest of the Nation's work. Today, thanks to the application of science, only 10 workers out of each 100 are needed on the farms to grow the food and fiber for the rest of our people. The other 90 are free to man the machines and sell the goods and provide the services which spell prosperity, comfort, and even luxury by standards elsewhere, for the people of the United States.

A second achievement is the attainment of a high degree of social mobility. Making it possible for the children of the industrial worker and the farmer to gain an education certainly has played a major role in this development. These students have demonstrated that good marks in school do not depend on wealth and social position but upon ability and ambition of the individual.

We have seen tremendous increases in enrollments in our colleges and universities. In the land-grant institutions enrollments have jumped from about

190,000 in 1935 to about 650,000 at present. There is every indication this increase will continue and at an even greater pace.

Competition is becoming keener for qualified faculty to teach in our land-grant institutions. Unless we are able to increase salaries and provide our staff with the necessary equipment and facilities our institutions will be unable to continue to make the contribution to the progress of this Nation which they have done in the past.

We are at a critical point in the further development of our educational system. Decisions are being made which will determine whether the land-grant philosophy of education for all will continue or whether we gradually revert to the situation of a hundred years ago of education for the select few. With the tremendous increase in students of college age and with a higher percentage of them wanting to go to college, some people are questioning whether a college education should be made available to all who desire it. They say it is too expensive for the public to support and the student should shoulder more of the cost.

Any proposal that a student be required to pay the greater part or all of the cost of his higher education is heresy in America because it prices out of an educational opportunity large numbers of able youngsters born into families of limited means. It is essential that we continue to make it possible for the student with limited financial resources but with ability and ambition to achieve a college education.

The last increase in appropriations for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions was made in 1935. Inflation and population increases since that time make it essential for the Congress to make adjustments in appropriations for these institutions.

At this time when the land-grant philosophy of education is being attacked, the passage of these bills would be one step toward helping this educational system continue to make its unique contribution to the Nation and the world. I strongly support these bills which provide an increase in funds for resident teaching at land-grant institutions.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Fayetteville, May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I deeply appreciate your invitation to present my views relative to H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 which are identical bills to authorize an increase in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant colleges and universities. It will not be possible for me to appear in person. Therefore, I am writing this statement which I shall be glad to have included in the proceedings of your committee.

I strongly endorse and urge favorable action on this legislation. I am in complete accord with the points contained in the excellent statement presented in support of the bills by Dr. John T. Caldwell, chairman of the Legislative Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities in his appearance before your committee on May 16, 1960.

This proposed legislation is in accord with long-established and universally approved principles of Federal-State relations. The additional funds are urgently needed to offset the effect of inflation and to assist in supporting the vastly expanded teaching responsibilities necessarily assumed by land-grant colleges and universities since 1935 when the last increase was approved. In the light of these conditions, the additional amounts are quite modest.

Congressman E. C. Gathings, a member of your committee, feels that the formula for distribution should not lean too heavily on a population basis. In his opinion, account should be taken of enrollments in land-grant institutions in the allocation of that portion of the funds which traditionally has been allocated on the basis of population. While I have not had an opportunity to give careful study to the suggestion of Congressman Gathings, I believe it deserves consideration.

The additional funds which this legislation would provide are urgently needed by the University of Arkansas to support teaching activities in the fields of agri-

culture, mechanic arts, and related areas. I am sure other land-grant colleges and universities have equally urgent needs. Therefore, it is my earnest hope that this legislation will receive favorable action and that those additional funds will be made available at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. MULLINS, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Storrs, Conn., May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: In view of the forthcoming hearing scheduled for Tuesday of this week, may I join my many colleagues in writing to you of our hope and desire that your committee may take favorable action with reference to the identical bills, H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, which authorize an increase in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

The spokesmen for our association have adequately covered the urgency and need for a review of this matter. May I underscore their very significant statements and express the hope that favorable consideration may be given to this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

A. N. JORGENSEN, *President.*

PURDUE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Lafayette, Ind., May 21, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This statement is in support of H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, in response to your letter of May 16, 1960. These identical bills would authorize an increase in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant colleges and State universities.

As president of a land-grant university and as a former president of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, I endorse fully the statement made before your committee on May 16, 1960 by Chancellor John T. Caldwell of North Carolina State College.

As a nation the finest investment we can make in our future security and well-being is in the training of able minds to their highest level of capability. Well-developed brainpower and trained leadership constitute one of our most potent sources of national strength today. Not to develop these items to their highest potential is just as wasteful of our resources as not to exploit our fertile fields, a pit of iron ore, or a bed of uranium.

The world's frontier today is one of the mind. It is a scientific frontier. It is vertical rather than horizontal. It is limited only by the mind and the imagination of man.

It is on this frontier that the free world must stand or fall in its struggle with totalitarianism. We must continuously train our young men and women in our university classrooms and laboratories so that they in turn may effectively fill their own battle position on the frontier of useful knowledge. That nation which succeeds best in this task will be the victor in the global struggle which engulfs this generation.

The heavy financial needs of higher education are a matter of record. These have been presented fully to this committee in prior testimony.

The amount of increased financial support for the land-grant colleges and universities authorized by these bills is both logical and modest. The increase is in proportion to U.S. population growth since 1935 (the date of the last adjustment in appropriation for this purpose) and to the amount of price inflation since that date. It does not take into account the substantially higher proportion of the total population of college age actually enrolled in colleges or universities, or the greater relative cost now than 25 years ago of educating an individual student because of the great extensions of knowledge which have accrued in that interval. The proposed increase seeks only to restore in today's

situation the relative minimum level of support the Congress evidently intended in the 1935 legislation.

Significantly, the proposed legislation does not open up any new question of Federal support for education. It would merely build on the base of partial Federal support for State educational institutions which has been evolved so satisfactorily over several decades of operation.

The passage of this legislation would be a significant step in assuring continuation of higher educational opportunity for superior minds in all of our 50 States and Puerto Rico within the financial reach of everyone.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK L. HOVDE, *President.*

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY,
State College, Miss., May 18, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
U.S. Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: We are informed that the land-grant teaching funds bills, H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, are scheduled for additional hearings by the House Agriculture Committee on May 24.

The essence of these bills, as understood here, is an adjustment of the level of appropriated grants from a point established in 1935.

We urge your support of this legislation, if in good conscience you can give it, on bases of (1) adjustment to compensate for inflation, (2) confidence in the role that has been and will be played by land-grant institutions in American higher education, and (3) the stark need for dollars in these days of burgeoning enrollment and demands more and finer services.

Sincerely yours,

BEN HILBUN, *President.*

CLEMSON COLLEGE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Clemson, S.C., May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I appreciate very much your kind invitation to present my views on H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, bills which would authorize an increase in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. I am sorry that I cannot be present at committee hearings on May 24, but on that date I am scheduled to participate in the annual War College National Security Forum at Montgomery, Ala.

Since I cannot appear before your committee, I submit herewith a statement to be filed for the record.

1. I am as a matter of principle in opposition to those forms of Federal aid to education which by their nature lead to Federal controls and to loss of local autonomy in the vital business of training our youth. I support H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 because they are not aimed at establishing such odious controls.

2. It is clear, then, that H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 involve no change in long-established principles of State and Federal relationships. Rather these twin bills simply recognize that the present money authorization for resident instructional purposes was set 25 years ago, and is today woefully inadequate. The steady inflation of the dollar and the mounting enrollments of our land-grant colleges are factors which indicate the positive necessity of enacting the bills in question. The present support figure of \$5,051,500 is simply unrealistic; the proposed support figure of \$14,500,200 represents a bare minimum if we are to have resident instruction programs worthy of the name.

3. My 23 years in American business, coupled with my 4 years in the administration of Clemson College have convinced me that the most serious problems in our Nation are those related to the higher education of our youth. I am further convinced that our land-grant colleges and universities, enrolling more than 21 percent of all college undergraduates and more than 50 percent of graduate students in science areas, must lead in the solution of these problems. I agree completely with newspaperman John Cowles of Minneapolis in his statement that

unless the Nation's land-grant institutions are enabled to meet their responsibilities, the chances of survival of this Nation as an enlightened democracy are dim indeed.

To conclude my statement, let me urge your committee, Sir, to report unchanged the two bills, H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974; and to work on the floor of the House for their enactment.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. EDWARDS, *President.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Madison, Wis., May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: We are advised that the House Agricultural Committee will hold a hearing on May 24 on the land-grant teaching fund bills, H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974.

In the interest of the development and defense of our Nation, I urge that your committee give these bills favorable consideration and recommend a substantial increase in land-grant teaching funds from Federal sources.

We believe that an adequate program of higher education for our young people is vital to the general welfare, and as such is a national as well as a State concern. The relationship between the Federal Government and the land-grant colleges and State universities in educational matters has proved to be a unique and practical one. However, the financial burden in providing higher education for the rapidly expanding population is a very heavy one at this time and is mounting from year to year. Yet Federal aid for the teaching programs of these institutions has not been increased since 1935, and no allowance has been made for the tremendous rise in student numbers and the equally striking increase in dollar costs of education due largely to inflationary changes beyond our control. This of course means that the Federal Government carries a smaller and smaller part of the total load and that the States carry an increasingly large burden.

We hope that the present Congress will find it possible to make a major improvement in this situation. We would also appreciate any support which you can give to increasing Federal grants for the agricultural research and extension programs in the various States. Your interest in these programs in the past has been of inestimable value to agriculture and to the public at large.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. ELVEHJEM, *President.*

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Pullman, Wash., May 20, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: I am advised that on May 16 Dean Andre of Iowa State University and Chancellor John T. Caldwell of North Carolina State College testified before your committee in support of H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, the land-grant teaching funds bills.

As immediate past president of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and as the present chairman of its executive committee, I urge most strongly support for the bills in question. This will represent an extremely modest addition to the teaching funds allocated to the land-grant institution or institutions in each State. However, the passage of such legislation will be of real help to the institutions concerned in meeting the pressures of increasing enrollment. This would proceed through long-established channels and would be consistent with one of the longest traditions of support for higher education in our country.

There is little I could add to the testimony which has been presented, so that this letter is to indicate my strong support of the testimony as given by our two representatives.

Sincerely yours,

C. CLEMENT FRENCH, *President.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 3, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: I wanted very much to be able to get to your hearing last Tuesday on the land-grant teaching funds bills, H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974. However, I had made some previous commitments, and it was simply impossible for me to get away.

I wanted to tell you and the committee of the need for this legislation by the University of Connecticut, the land-grant institution for my State which is located in my congressional district.

As Dr. Albert N. Jorgensen, the distinguished educator and president of the University of Connecticut, has pointed out in a letter to me, the last appropriated grants to the land-grant institutions were established 24 years ago. The 1935 aid level needs to be brought up to date in terms of our current population and dollar value, and I urge the committee's favorable support of H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974.

With my warmest regards.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1960.

HON. HAROLD COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COOLEY: I wish to join with the remarks contained in the letter of May 20 by President John T. Fey, of the University of Vermont, in support of your bill, H.R. 10876, and others which would provide increases in the authorized appropriations for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

Colleges operating under the land-grant program have contributed substantially to the development of our Nation, as you well know, and it is important that their resident teaching grant program be maintained at a level adequate to meet the changing emphasis and needs of our times. I hope that early and favorable action can be taken on this legislation.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM MEYER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
Athens, May 18, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COOLEY: I have just read Dr. John T. Caldwell's testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture regarding the need for increased support for college teaching in our land-grant colleges and State universities. I am a member of the executive committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and know of the great concern of all of our institutions regarding the need for increased support for teaching.

It has been pointed out that there has been little increase in these funds during the past several years. We believe that the 40-percent population increase factor and the inflationary factor justify an increase in funds for this important function of land-grant colleges and State universities.

I hope your committee will give thoughtful consideration to H.R. 10974 which authorizes an increase in funds for instruction.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

O. C. ADERHOLD, *President.*

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New Brunswick, N.J., June 1, 1960.

Mrs. CHRISTINE S. GALLAGHER,
*Clerk, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MRS. GALLAGHER: Thank you very much for your letter.

I enclose herewith a letter forwarded to our Congressmen regarding H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974. I hope this information is not too late to be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

MASON W. GROSS.

RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New Brunswick, N.J.

As the land-grant university of the State of New Jersey, Rutgers hopes for affirmative action by the Congress on recently introduced legislation to increase current appropriations for teaching funds at the land-grant institutions.

I refer specifically to H.R. 10876, introduced on March 3 by Mr. Cooley, and H.R. 10974, introduced on March 8 by Mr. Dixon. These are identical bills; they have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Each bill states as its purpose: "To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions."

My purpose in writing is to say that the proposed increase in teaching funds would be of tremendous help to the State university of New Jersey in its efforts to discharge its responsibilities to the youth of our State.

As I am sure you know, demands placed upon us are becoming progressively heavy, and we are doing everything in our power to prepare ourselves for the sharp rise in enrollment which will be felt, particularly in September of 1961, and in the succeeding years of this decade.

The successful outcome of the New Jersey college bond referendum last November is, of course, providing great help in resolving our problem of physical facilities, but we are a long way from solving the problem of maintaining and strengthening our faculty and the other resources essential to the high-quality educational program the people of New Jersey deserve and demand.

If the proposed program for further Federal aid to the land-grant institutions is approved by the Congress, this action will provide a total of \$250,000 to Rutgers as compared with the current annual appropriation of \$118,233.27. This increase is urgently needed.

I do hope that the proposals outlined above will have your interest and support. Please let me know if there are questions I can answer with respect to this matter.

Sincerely,

MASON W. GROSS.

BERLIN, CONN., *May 16, 1960.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. Based on testimony previously submitted in this hearing, I would like to suggest that the request for authorization of funds in H.R. 10876 be increased from \$9 million which is based on the 1865 student formula, to the present-day student formula, which would call for at least \$130 million, plus an additional \$5 million to take care of future increased enrollment.

2. I also suggest that the committee adopt a resolution thanking all of the land-grant colleges for their good work in carrying out their duties and thus making this one of the outstanding programs of our country for citizenship and leadership training. (I might say here that Connecticut University has specialized in egg laying and prize chicken development; and, Cornell University and Madison University have specialized in health food research, resulting in our agricultural abundance at this time.)

3. Further, I suggest that ten \$100 scholarships per college, be awarded out of the \$5 million special fund above referred to, to honor local past graduates who have achieved in the fields of leadership and scholastic standing.

D. T. LARSON.

KINGSTON, R.I., May 21, 1960.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I urge the enactment of H.R. 10876 to increase annual appropriations for residence teaching grants to land-grant colleges. A basic problem of higher education today is the compelling need for funds for faculty salaries, in Rhode Island, as in all States, we must meet the challenge of skyrocketing enrollments. H.R. 10876 will provide additional funds to strengthen the university's faculty in critical fields. The State is increasing appropriations for higher education as rapidly as possible. But further Federal assistance is essential. I hope your committee will press for passage of this vital bill.

FRANCIS HORN,
President, University of Rhode Island.

FARGO, N. DAK., May 19, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:*

We concur fully in the statements of our colleague's president, John Caldwell, Dean Floyd Andre, and Executive Secretary Russell Thackrey in support of an essential adjustment in resident teaching grants, to compensate for inflation and consequent decline in dollar value in the Morrill and Bankhead-Jones funds since 1935. The land-grant colleges and universities constitute one of the Nation's great bulwarks against ignorance and complacency. Their on-going under present serious financial handicaps can be improved through the legislation proposed in H.R. 10974. We urgently request favorable action by the committees and the Congress on this legislation.

FRED HULTZ,
President, North Dakota Agriculture College.

LEXINGTON, KY., May 19, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives, Washington D.C.:

Would like to join other land-grant institutions in giving full support to H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974.

FRANK G. DICKEY,
President, University of Kentucky.

TUCSON, ARIZ., May 23, 1960.

Hon. HAROLD COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Congress of the
United States, Washington, D.C.:*

H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, which would authorize increases in the appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions, would in effect raise the level of support to instruction to a point approximately equal to the prewar II level. Drastic inflation, particularly that involving cost of instruction, together with the greatly enhanced student enrollment, urgently requires this additional financial assistance if the normal and traditional purposes of grants for instruction in land-grant institutions are to be met. Respectfully urge recommendation and approval of these bills.

RICHARD A. HARVILL,
President, University of Arizona.

CORVALLIS, OREG., May 24, 1960.

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representative,
Washington, D.C.:*

The increase in appropriations for resident teaching of agriculture as provided in H.R. 10974 is reasonable and highly desirable. Reasonable from standpoint of bringing up the allotment to the States somewhat equivalent to what was

intended in 1935, and desirable from the standpoint of the importance of agricultural science to our economy. There is no relationship in this to the number of students returning to the farm and should not be confused by any such argument. Because of our situation in Oregon, where instruction funds are appropriated to a board which supervises several institutions, we would prefer that the act include a clause stating that the increase be "in addition to present funds and not in lieu of money from other sources."

We thank you for your consideration.

A. L. STRAND,
President, Oregon State College.

DURHAM, N.H., May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*

H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 will give the land-grant universities same proportion of support intended in 1935. Inflation and population increase fully justify this change. Furthermore, universities now facing unusual demands for increased educational opportunity urgently need this equitable adjustment which involves no change whatever in long-established principal in Federal-State relationships.

Strongly urge support of bill by your committee.

ELDON L. JOHNSON,
President, University of New Hampshire.

KINGSTON, R.I., May 21, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:*

I urge the enactment of H.R. 10876 to increase annual appropriations for residence teaching grants to land-grant colleges. As basic problems of higher education today is the compelling need for funds for faculty salaries, in Rhode Island, as in all States, we must meet the challenge of sky rocketing enrollments. H.R. 10876 will provide additional funds to strengthen the universities faculty in critical fields. The State is increasing appropriations for higher education as rapidly as possible. But further Federal assistance is essential. I hope your committee will press for passage of this vital bill.

FRANCIS H. HORN,
President, University of Rhode Island.

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 24, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:*

Our university urgently needs the reappraisal and reapportionment of Morrill Act funds proposed in H.R. 10974. Funds now provided have become a decreasing percentage of our costs of instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts. These fields have increased in importance, complexity, and scope so costs have risen necessarily while the 1935 dollars appropriated have shrunk as inflation progressed. Added costs of new laboratory instruction need added support and contributions of your land-grant institutions. Continue to provide the progress essential to the health of our future economy. We urge support for and enactment of H.R. 10974.

NOVICE G. FAWCETT,
President, the Ohio State University.

The CHAIRMAN. We will also insert into the record a letter dated May 23, 1960, received from the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture at this point, as well as a letter dated May 23, 1960, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(The letters dated May 23, 1960, from the Department of Agriculture and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of March 4 for a report on H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

This Department makes no recommendation as to the enactment of this bill since it relates to a provision of law administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The primary purpose of this bill is to authorize increased appropriations in the form of grant funds for resident teaching at land-grant institutions. It would also authorize the University of Puerto Rico to participate in the benefits of the program on the same basis as the States. The basic legislation would not be modified in other respects. Specific conditions contained in the bill are as follows: (1) Increases the amount to be equally distributed to States from \$1 million each fiscal year to \$7,650,000; and (2) increases the amount to be distributed annually on the basis of relative population from \$1,501,500 each fiscal year to \$4,300,000.

While we have no information as to the need for larger Federal grants, strengthening the resident teaching program at the land-grant institutions would be of direct benefit to this Department by improving the quality of instruction and probably by increasing the number of students who would be trained in agricultural subjects. This, of course, is very important because of the high percentage of employees recruited by this Department from these institutions. The need for more persons trained in agriculture is increasing. Commercial organizations in recent years have expanded their recruitment programs in the land-grant institutions and this had made it increasingly difficult to attract agriculturally trained students for positions in this Department.

Continuing scientific programs in all areas affecting agriculture will require a progressive increase in the number of technically trained people with farm and agricultural college background. Shortages in the biological sciences are just as great as they are in physics, engineering, and other technical fields. Because of the growing complexity and increased dependence on science and technology in all phases of agriculture, there will be an increasing demand for technically trained personnel beyond that required in Federal, State, and industrial research. The increasing amount of basic research in the Department of Agriculture and at the agricultural experiment station also calls for more specialized training on the graduate level.

It is our understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will comment on H.R. 10876 from the standpoint of the general relationship of the Federal Government to institutions of higher learning.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON, *Assistant Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of March 23, 1960, for a report on H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

This bill would amend section 22 (7 U.S.C. 329) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, to increase the authorization for annual appropriations for Federal grants to the States for the support of resident teaching in land-grant colleges and universities, and to include Puerto Rico in the provisions of the act. The existing authorization of \$1 million, allotted equally among the States, would be increased to \$7,650,000; the authorization of \$1,501,500, allotted on the basis of relative State population, would be increased to \$4,300,000. Thus the total increase in authorized annual appropriations for these purposes would be \$9,448,500.

Annual appropriations for a grant of \$50,000 to each State to be applied to instruction in land-grant institutions are also authorized by the second (1890) Morrill Act, as amended. Puerto Rico is eligible to receive these grants. The funds made available under the Bankhead-Jones and the Second Morrill Acts may be used only for "instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and in the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic science * * * and to facilities for such instruction." The appropriations authorized under both acts for these purposes total \$5,051,500. The proposed increase in the section 22 authorization would increase the total authorization of appropriations for this purpose by approximately 140 percent.

We are, of course, fully aware of the immeasurable contribution which our land-grant institutions have made and are making to the cause of higher education in this country. However, we do not believe that additional Federal appropriations limited to this particular group of institutions can be justified in the light of present day needs in higher education and in the light of the contribution that many other institutions of higher education, public and private, can make in meeting these needs. Any Federal aid to higher education should be pinpointed toward high priority needs and should be made available to any qualified institution of higher education able and willing to do its part in meeting these needs. This basic principle underlies the National Defense Education Act and all legislative proposals which this administration has made or endorsed in aid of higher education, including its pending proposal for Federal assistance in the construction of housing and academic facilities (H.R. 4267 and H.R. 4415).

For these reasons we are unable to recommend enactment of H.R. 10876.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your Committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, *Secretary*.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to recognize you at this time, Mr. Thackrey.

Mr. THACKREY. Mr. Chairman, would you like me to present the names of all of the witnesses, or just as they appear?

The CHAIRMAN. Just as you desire, sir. You may have them present their statements, or if any one of them wants to insert a statement in the record, we will be glad to have the statement inserted.

Mr. THACKREY. Our first witness will be Chancellor Clifford H. Hardin, of the University of Nebraska, who is president of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Professor Hardin, we will be very glad to have you present your statement now.

STATEMENT OF CHANCELLOR CLIFFORD M. HARDIN, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, LINCOLN, NEBR., PRESIDENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES

(The complete prepared statement of Mr. Hardin is as follows:)

TESTIMONY BY CHANCELLOR CLIFFORD M. HARDIN, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Clifford M. Hardin. I am chancellor of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, and am serving this

year as president of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities.

Before saying something about the problems and opportunities of higher education as we see them from our institution in Lincoln, I would like to turn to some questions raised at the hearing before this committee on May 16. Inquiries were made at that time as to the effect of shifting the allocations now made on a population basis under the Bankhead-Jones Act to a formula based upon current enrollment of the land-grant institutions in the several States. The executive secretary of our association, Mr. Russell I. Thackrey, has not been able in the time available to work out calculations for all the States of the effects of such a shift. However, the matter has been discussed among officers of the association, and certain analyses have been made on the basis of which I offer the following observations for the information and consideration of this committee:

(1) Both the present formula and the one proposed in H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974, as you know, provide for allocation of funds on the basis of flat grants and of population as of each decennial census. The question of shifting to an enrollment basis for that portion of the amounts represented by variable grants has been raised by committee members who were conscious of situations in which populations have increased substantially. In other words, they are the States in which for the most part a relatively high proportion of young people attend college. They are also in some instances States with relatively low per capita income.

I should like to call your attention first to the fact that the proposed increase in flat grants to each State protects the interests of these States to a substantial extent since it includes a 40-percent increase as a population-growth factor, based on the increase in total U.S. population. This tends to counteract any disadvantage these States may suffer from having the smaller amount of grants figured on a population basis. While some States in this group might benefit by shifting from a population to an enrollment basis, since they have a higher percentage of land-grant enrollment than population, several would suffer substantially if the entire amount of the flat grants in the new legislation were shifted to an enrollment basis. Each State under the proposed legislation would receive approximately 2 percent of the flat grants. Any State which has less than 2 percent of total land-grant enrollment would suffer if enrollments were used as the sole basis of allocation.

(2) A further complication is involved in the fact that some States have one major State institution which is the land-grant State university. Others have two major institutions (or more), of which one is land-grant institution. Iowa is an example of this situation. Thus although total enrollment in the two major State institutions of Iowa is high relative to population, only one of these is counted in land-grant enrollment, while in another State, such as Nebraska, there is only one major State institution. Use of an enrollment basis would tend to discriminate against the States having two major institutions, since it would be virtually impossible to isolate out at a combined institution the exact enrollments which are attributable especially to its functions as a land-grant institution.

(3) Shifting from a population to an enrollment basis at this time would drastically affect the allocations to certain States which have a relatively low percentage of students in their land-grant institutions at this time (as compared to population) but which face some of the most critical problems of caring for large additional members of students in the future. Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey are examples. It would reduce, relatively, the immediate ability of the land-grant institutions in these States to provide for expected large increases in enrollment. At the same time, it would over the long run place certain of these States in an advantageous position relative to the States which now have high enrollments and relatively low populations, and also relatively low incomes.

(4) The present formula—the same as the one proposed in these bills—has the advantage of simplicity and is easy to administer. Because the variable grant is on the basis of population as of each decennial census, the amounts involved are fixed and constant over a 10-year period as a basis for budgetary and other planning. While this may have both undesirable and desirable features, it is consistent with the objectives of the bills in bringing the 1935 allocations up to date in terms of 1960. The heads of all the land-grant institutions are familiar with this and have agreed to it.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that while the present formula is not perfect it is probably as equitable as may be arrived at at the present time. To devise a new one which would take into account all the factors of enrollment, diversity of institutions, per capita income, prospective growth, and the like to which I have referred, would require the labors of a considerable staff for an extended period.

I do believe that, if the proposed legislation is enacted as I hope it will be, this committee should review it after it has been in operation for about 5 years. At that time the impact of the sharp increase in college enrollments which will occur in the immediate future will be much clearer than it is at present, and a determination made as to whether or not corrections are needed.

Mr. HARDIN. I might add to this formal statement, Mr. Chairman, that we have made some computations at our own institution in Nebraska. The contribution under these combined bills in 1935 represented a little over 8 percent of our teaching budget, whereas for this coming year it will amount to $1\frac{1}{4}$ percent, on the basis of the present appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Hardin, for your statement. How many of the land-grant colleges in the association are State universities—about all of them?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes, all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. And does that organization support the legislation that we have before us?

Mr. HARDIN. It does; yes, indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

Mr. POAGE. Does not the whole trend of your discussion simply point out that there would be a considerable change if we went to the enrollment basis?

What are we trying to do by giving these institutions this money? Who are we trying to help?

Mr. HARDIN. We are trying to help these students. Of course; that is the primary objective.

Mr. POAGE. The students who are taking agriculture and mechanical courses?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. If we based this simply on an enrollment basis, it would become a Federal aid-to-education program; would it not? If we are going to hand out the money to every educational institution in the various States, we have simply got a Federal aid-to-education bill; have we not?

I do not ask your views as to whether Federal aid to education is something that you are for or against. We expect to vote on that in the near future in the House.

I am interested in giving special aid to this particular type of institution. That is what the original bill was for. That is why we established the land-grant system. It was to establish agriculture and mechanical institutions in the colleges of this Nation.

Should not our assistance be in proportion to the population in the States who are being served by the agricultural and mechanical institutions?

Mr. HARDIN. It probably does not make a great deal of difference in the long run. As I tried to indicate, it would be of advantage to some of the States.

Mr. POAGE. I know that you indicated that it would be of advantage to some of the States some of the time. You point out that in certain Eastern States, that the immediate effect of it would be to hurt them, but in the long run that they would get the advantage if this aid were put on the enrollment basis.

Mr. HARDIN. I think the point is that it is very difficult to differentiate. For example, in my institution the students that are primarily engaged in agricultural and mechanical arts—we could make a good guess at it——

Mr. POAGE. In fact, the weak point in this bill is that it so closely approaches straight Federal aid.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that this present program as suggested would make a difference?

Mr. HARDIN. It has, at least, the advantage of being well understood. I might say that my own institution, that is, in it it would not make a bit of difference.

Mr. POAGE. The reason we had the other formula was that at that time you did not have any enrollment. At that time we were establishing new institutions. Obviously, you had to use some other formula.

Mr. HARDIN. We did in 1897 and 1935.

Mr. POAGE. That was necessary at that time. The old formula was not established to meet the conditions of growing institutions, but was a formula which was to serve the needs of the institutions which were not in existence. It was to enable us to create these institutions.

It seems to me that we have an entirely different situation now. I am not saying anything about Iowa or Nebraska, but I am speaking of Texas, where I want to increase the money for the agriculture and mechanical college. I went to the University of Texas, but I am not willing to use this agricultural money to endow the University of Texas. I would like to see that institution prosper. I would like to see it develop. But this is not the place to come to endow the University of Texas.

Mr. HARDIN. I think that we would agree that philosophically here there is a good basis for using enrollment figures as a basis for, at least, a part of the distribution of these funds.

I think there is something to be said for having part of it on a flat basis. But you do have this problem, that I think from an administrative point of view, at least, it should be considered, that is, the enrollment changes every year, and perhaps you could arrive at some base that would be used for 10 years, but I think that there is some advantage in having a definite figure for a decade for us to work with on this, whether it is enrollment or population.

I hope that it could be that so that there would be a certain amount of stability in it.

Mr. POAGE. You referred to the States of New Jersey and New York and Pennsylvania, I believe——

Mr. HARDIN. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Which have a very small enrollment at the present time, but if they would later have a large enrollment as it was hoped, it would increase their amount. When they have a small enrollment, they do not need much Federal help, but when they have a large enrollment, they should get a larger share of the Federal help.

I would mention the situation in the State from which the gentleman from Oklahoma comes. When I was a boy, Oklahoma A. & M. did not amount to much. But Oklahoma State University today is one of our great institutions.

Mr. ALBERT. That is so long ago that you refer to, that I do not remember. [Laughter.]

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It was then the Indian Territory, but its A. & M. is now a great institution. Obviously, they are not entitled to the same amount of money when they had only 400 students enrolled as they are when they have 5,000 or 10,000 students.

Mr. DIXON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. This is the line of reasoning that we followed when we started these hearings. I think much can be said for Mr. Poage's point of view.

There is another thought that I was thinking about. One reason, possibly, why some of these land-grant colleges have small enrollments is due to the fact that the State encouraged other institutions to build strong departments of agriculture.

That is not only true in the State institutions, but also, in private institutions. And I do not think that priority in developing strong departments of agriculture should be given to the land-grant colleges.

Would not a resort to a formula like we have in many of our programs of Federal help to institutions based upon enrollment, tend to make the States centralize agriculture more in the land-grant colleges where it belongs?

Mr. HARDIN. I think that it would, sir, yes.

Mr. DIXON. Thank you.

Mr. ALBERT. Would you yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the universities have strong mechanical departments as well as agricultural departments; do they not?

Mr. HARDIN. A great many of them have colleges of engineering.

Mr. ALBERT. I was inclined to agree with what Mr. Poage has been saying when the matter first came up, but after analyzing the flat grant, I think that we had better stick with what we have. You are not going to be able to change a school's plan or faculty on the basis of a guess as to what the enrollment might be next year. If grants are based on year-to-year populations, you will run into fluctuations in operating your plant that would not be satisfactory.

Mr. HARDIN. It would be a handicap. There are several ways that this can be done. I think that we could argue that the enrollment basis would be all right, and we could argue that some other basis would be all right, with good logic.

It is simply this, that after we have considered all of the factors, we are inclined to feel that all things considered on balance, this represents about the most workable plan and the simplest plan to accomplish the objective.

I would not argue with you a minute on changing to another plan.

Mr. POAGE. Again, I will use Texas as an example, because it is the only State with which I am even reasonably familiar. To what school will this money go? Texas A. & M.?

Mr. HARDIN. Texas A. & M.

Mr. POAGE. Texas University has a big engineering department. And Sam Houston State College has an agriculture department. Would they be given money, and if so on what basis?

I am asking for information. On what basis would they get assistance if they would get any? I thought that it went on the basis of the students taking agricultural and mechanical courses.

Mr. HARDIN. This would go to the institutions that are part of the land-grant system as defined in the original Morrill Act and the amendments thereto which in Texas, I believe I am right, Mr. Thackrey can correct me if I am wrong, would include Texas A. & M.

Mr. THACKREY. Yes. The Texas A. & M. system.

Mr. POAGE. And that would include the Negro college at Prairie View, and the two north Texas branch colleges?

Mr. HARDIN. This is by action of the Texas Legislature, I believe.

Mr. POAGE. It is the constitution which created Texas A. & M. Texas A. & M. is older than the University of Texas. The constitution says that it shall be part of the university, but to operate independently, and it did, until the university found oil, and then Texas A. & M. decided that it was indeed a part of the university.

Mr. HARDIN. But the inclusion of these other campuses was a later action.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Will you yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was going to yield to Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. PIRNIE. It is on the same point. Do I understand, for instance, as to the State of New York, that the allocation of funds there would be on the basis of the ratio of population in the State of New York, but that the funds received by the State would then be allocated to those institutions within the State who are members of the land-grant group?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes, that is right.

I believe that Cornell is the institution in New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I am familiar with that fact.

Mr. HARDIN. Yes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hoeven.

Mr. HOEVEN. As you have so well pointed out, the use of an enrollment basis would discriminate against Iowa. We not only have two major institutions, but actually have three major institutions in our State. The land-grant college used to be called Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts. Its name has now been changed to Iowa State University.

We, also have a State University of Iowa.

And we have an Iowa State Teachers College.

A moment ago Dr. Dixon said that he objected to any outside colleges having a strong department of agriculture. By the same token, do you not think that the land-grant colleges should remain within their own bailiwick, and not go out and take over courses now being taught in universities and State colleges?

Mr. HARDIN. I have read some of the newspaper accounts from Iowa, sir. And maybe I had better stay out of that one. I know that there is an issue there.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am not asking you to commit yourself. If we are going to be so jealous of the rights and the prerogatives of a land-

grant college, then I think we should stick to the original purposes for setting up these colleges and have them teach agricultural and mechanical arts courses of study.

Many land-grant colleges have liberal arts courses, and they grant bachelor of science degrees in English and in foreign languages and all of that. It seems to me they are going far afield from the original purposes of land-grant colleges.

If we are going to give Federal help to the land-grant colleges they should not be expanding and taking over the functions of State universities and at the same time hope to maintain their integrity and status as land-grant colleges.

This is something that ought to be very carefully considered.

Mr. HARDIN. Yes. This situation varies greatly from State to State. We have only the single institution. In other words, where the original allocation was made to a separate agricultural and mechanical arts institution they have, of course, found through the years it necessary to provide certain liberal arts subjects, coupled with the education of the engineers, and also home economics, and so forth. And this, I think, everyone is agreed is proper.

There has been some discussion in some States as to how far this specialization should go—should you have an English student only, or should you permit some other students to major in English. I think that this is a separate issue.

I would, if you will permit me, not to become involved in that discussion.

Mr. HOEVEN. It seems to me that a land-grant college, regardless of what State it is in, should not get too far afield from the original purpose in establishing such college.

Mr. SHORT. Will you yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. To clarify this distinction a little bit more, it is not clear in my mind as to what constitutes a land-grant college.

In North Dakota I am sure that the State university and the State agricultural institution participate equally in the benefits from the land-grant college funds.

Mr. HARDIN. I do not think so. I think that North Dakota State College is a land-grant institution and is the only one of the institutions that receives grants under this act.

Mr. SHORT. There is the allocation of funds from the revenue obtained by the State land department from the land that was granted to the State for the support of educational institutions—that is allocated specifically not only to our State university and to our agricultural college, but to some of our State normals. Are they not, in effect, all land-grant colleges?

Mr. HARDIN. Not in the legal sense under the Morrill Act. I think I am right on that.

I suspect that your situation is similar to ours. We have a State commission of lands, and the funds received from the lands which it administers, that support other educational institutions in the State, but the University of Nebraska was the only institution that received grants under the Morrill Act of 1862.

Mr. SHORT. You are talking about the land grants?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes, under this specific legislation. And I believe that North Dakota is the only institution that receives currently under the

Morrill and Bankhead-Jones Acts the annual appropriation for teaching purposes. Am I right?

Mr. THACKREY. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. We are talking about land-grant colleges here. I was just trying to clarify what was a land-grant institution.

Mr. HARDIN. There were land grants made for a variety of purposes in the early days, as you gentlemen well know. And we have used this, I suppose, rather loosely, but we refer here to the institutions designated under the Morrill Act of 1862, and the amendments thereto.

The North Dakota State College is the institution in North Dakota that participates under this legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Thank you.

Mr. DIXON. I have just one question.

Your institution has already right now the appropriation for the current year?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes.

Mr. DIXON. Would there be any difficulty at all to turn over to a formula based on enrollment?

Mr. HARDIN. The figure that is most commonly used is the fall term enrollment which, I think, is produced by the Office of Education and is released along about November of each year. And this is computed for each university.

Mr. DIXON. That would not be an insurmountable obstacle at all. Thank you.

Mr. POAGE. May I go back to Mr. Short's question? How was the land-grant designation determined? I know in 1862 they knew what the colleges were, but a great many of them have come into the system since that time. I go back to my own State, where I know that an institution which teaches agricultural and mechanical arts has come in as a land-grant institution. Texas A. & M. was not opened until some years after 1862.

Mr. HARDIN. The State legislature so designates.

Mr. THACKREY. It is by act of the legislature.

Mr. POAGE. The number of designated institutions does not increase the amount of money to the State?

Mr. THACKREY. It does not.

Mr. POAGE. Why does it not? Of course, if you put it entirely on a population basis it would not increase it, but there are other factors than population.

Mr. HARDIN. And the flat grant, a flat amount to each State, which represents about 2 percent.

Mr. POAGE. That is the reason it makes no difference whether you have one or three or four land-grant colleges, the total amount of money will be the same?

Mr. HARDIN. That is another reason for keeping it on the population basis. Conceivably, if you put it on an enrollment basis, every State legislature could designate additional institutions.

Mr. POAGE. And every institution would be a land-grant college, and would make everybody who is studying engineering or agriculture in the State, in any State school, receive a grant?

Mr. HARDIN. That is true.

Mr. POAGE. But if we keep it on a population basis, only those institutions teaching engineering and agriculture would receive the grant?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. If, for instance, the University of Texas, and A. & M. were both land-grant institutions and you had 25,000 students, or 20,000 students, or whatever the number is, at the University of Texas, and 8,000 at the A. & M. College, you would simply dilute the amount per student?

Mr. HARDIN. That is right.

Mr. POAGE. You would not increase the total, but you would spread it over the total number with a lesser amount per capita?

Mr. HARDIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, very much, Mr. Hardin.

We will hear next from Mr. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., president of West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. If I may, may I say just a word? Mr. Stahr was a circuit judge in my State, and I am glad to have him here.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have our colleague here from West Virginia—we are glad to recognize Mr. Bailey.

STATEMENT OF ELVIS J. STAHR, JR., PRESIDENT, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY, MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

Mr. STAHR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Elvis J. Stahr, Jr. I am president of West Virginia University. I am also a member of the Legislative Committee of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. I appreciate the privilege of appearing before you to make this brief statement in regard to H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974. I am sure that I speak not only for West Virginia University, but also for all other land-grant institutions, in urging your favorable consideration of these identical measures.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a student at one of the greatest foreign institutions and a staff member at one of our own largest private institutions. I also had the privilege of serving as executive director of the President's Committee on Education Beyond High School a few years ago, which gave me an exceptional opportunity to gain an overview of American higher education. Against that background, and with no intent to disparage the contributions of any kind or class of institutions, I express the firm conviction that the establishment of the land-grant institutions nearly 100 years ago, as a direct result of Federal concern and action, is the most significant contribution to the development of higher education yet made in any nation or by any nation in all history.

These institutions are carrying a tremendous load today. They have two basic purposes, both in the national interest: (1) To provide genuine opportunity to individual American youth, regardless of family circumstances, to develop their own talents so that they may be enlightened, useful, and productive citizens, well-fitted for whatever calling they may have the ability and desire to pursue; and (2) to strengthen our Nation economically, culturally, politically, and militarily through research, through service to the people of the several States, and through helping to expand and extend the level and quality of education of our people, which is indispensable to successful self-government, cultural growth, and national strength.

There is nothing new, revolutionary, or, it seems to me, even controversial in the bills you are considering. The Federal Government fathered the land-grant colleges and has helped sustain them from the beginning. Their mother States have assumed a steadily increasing share of their support, however, both absolutely and relatively. They have become strong and immensely useful and valuable to both mother and father as a result. As we face the tremendous challenges of the sixties, it is surely not reasonable that father should slough off his continuing responsibility. Yet the bills before you would actually do no more than bring back father's share, the smaller share, to where it was 25 years ago. Mother's share has long since increased many times beyond its level of that time, measured by any imaginable standard.

All the members of this committee are familiar with the programs of research-support undertaken by the Federal Government in the last 15 years, in part to improve the prosperity and efficiency of our people and in part as a matter of sheer national necessity in this competitive world.

You also know of the great upsurge of enrollments in our elementary and secondary schools, which is now reaching the colleges and universities. You are familiar with the expansion of the vocational education programs, both in agriculture and in other fields; with the increased attention to soil conservation; with the 4-H Club work with our young people.

All of these programs are fine and essential, but I would remind you that they all take trained people to carry them out.

The bills before you—H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974—represent a modest attempt to do something on the side of educating the people who carry out so many of these essential programs.

As Chancellor Caldwell pointed out in his testimony last week, nearly 30 percent of all master's degrees in the field of education—the level required for high school teaching—are given in the land-grant institutions. Most of our soil conservation service workers, county agents, vocational agriculture teachers, 4-H workers, get their basic training in our land-grant colleges and universities. More than half the advanced degrees in the basic biological sciences—essential to research in these fields—are given in the land-grant graduate schools.

Mr. Chairman, we are not asking the National Government to assume a substantially new or larger share of the cost of paying faculty members in the land-grant institutions.

May I offer an illustration of how modest these bills really are? In West Virginia, the 1935-36 appropriation to land-grant institutions from State tax funds was \$1,262,000, while the Federal allocation for land-grant instructional purposes was \$70,000, of 5¼ percent of the basic operating budget; for 1959-60, the appropriation from State taxes was \$10,600,000, while the Federal allocation was \$90,000, or less than 1 percent of the basic operating budget. Under the legislation pending before you, West Virginia's Federal allocation would go up to about \$250,000 in 1960-61, yet the State appropriation for that year has already been increased about \$1,250,000 by the 1960 legislature. Thus, Federal percentage will go up only to about 2 percent, still far short of the 5¼ percent of 25 years ago. The enrollment at

the university, incidentally, has increased from 2,570 in the fall of 1935 to about 6,400 in the fall of 1959, or nearly 150 percent.

Further increases are inevitable, unless we simply fail to find the resources to enable us to take them. We are most reluctant to deny today's and tomorrow's youth as much of an opportunity as we afforded the youth of yesterday. This would be a tragedy for our State and for its young people, and if extended nationally would be a complete reversal of the American dream.

Mr. Chairman, may I include a quotation from the second report to the President by the non-partisan President's Committee on Education Beyond High School? In referring to the annual Federal grants to our land-grant institutions, the committee stated:

It should be noted that these annual sums were and are being provided only to institutions which have been designated by the States. Secondly, these funds are distributed on the basis of legislative formulas which have been an important influence in bringing forth education and research in some States where little existed before. Thirdly, the States and institutions in general have been free to set their own objectives and programs within the broad general outlines of the Federal grants. As a result, there has been little or no charge or complaint of Federal control in the administration of these educational programs now nearly a century old.

The grants do not provide for facilities, buildings, or maintenance. Nevertheless, they have had a great and lasting influence on education beyond the high school throughout the Nation. The land-grant system has grown steadily through the years and has given new breadth to traditional concepts of the functions of colleges and universities. It has been a major factor in encouraging the growth of State colleges and universities and the acceptance of science and engineering as a part of the college and university curriculum. Through its influence education was made more accessible and the civilizing influence of the university was extended throughout our culture.

I might interpolate that most of the State institutions which have been formed that are not land-grant schools have resulted from the philosophy of higher education which was first and firmly established in the land-grant acts.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that what we are asking, and all we are asking, is that this support from Federal sources be brought back somewhat nearer the level of effectiveness of 25 years ago. The amounts involved are not large in terms of the total support needed for teaching purposes in land-grant institutions, but they will be extremely helpful. They may make the "added difference" in many cases which will make it possible to retain many good people in teaching, in the face of competition from other areas which offer substantially higher financial rewards.

I thank the committee for its courtesy to me this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Stahr. Are there any questions? If not, we thank you for appearing here.

Mr. STAHR. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I now recognize our distinguished colleague member from West Virginia, Senator Jennings Randolph, with whom many of us served. We will be glad to hear from you now.

STATEMENT OF HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the opportunity, and I respond to the responsibility

this morning, to reinforce the excellent statement made by our rather recently acquired and distinguished educator, Dr. Elvis Stahr, who has come to head up West Virginia University at Morgantown in our State.

He has focused, very properly, attention on the general subject matter and also has been specific as to the impact of this legislation if it becomes law, that it would constructively assist West Virginia University as a land-grant institution.

I appear in favor of the legislative purpose which has been embodied in the bills presented by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, Mr. Cooley, with whom I had the pleasure of serving in the House, as I had the pleasure of serving with other Members who sit on this committee. I remember that.

But, I also am thinking in terms not only of the chairman's bill but also the measure which has been presented by Representative Dixon.

In other words, I believe there is an across-the-board approach to this problem. And I think that is as it should be in a matter of this kind.

In effect, in West Virginia, where we have percentagewise increased our contribution to the purpose of resident teaching in the land-grant college at the State university—in fact, the Federal Government is in the position of actively having decreased the amount of its contribution. And as Dr. Stahr has so well said, the funds to be used go for resident teaching alone.

May I express very strongly my sincere belief that the informed and inspired teaching which we so need in West Virginia, and which is so needed in other States, will be strengthened substantially by the additional funds which would be provided if this legislation is to become law.

I am delighted to associated myself this morning with Representatives Bailey and Hechler of our State delegation. Presumably, they will speak in their own time or, at least, embrace with me our appreciation of Dr. Stahr's leadership at the university. In his appearance here, he reflects, I believe, in a nonpartisan way, but yet in an effective appeal, the reasoning of West Virginians and the officials at the university on this vital matter.

I hope that within the judgment of the committee that favorable consideration may be given to his presentation and that the cumulative effect of those who believe in the passage of such legislation will cause the membership of the committee to act affirmatively on this matter.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Randolph.

The Chair now recognizes Congressman Bailey of West Virginia.

**STATEMENT OF HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF
THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA**

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here as dean of the delegation in the House from West Virginia to

support ardently and fullheartedly the proposal proposed by the president of our West Virginia University, Dr. Stahr.

I note that one of the other members of the delegation from West Virginia, Congressman Hechler, is present, and I will divide my 1 minute that I asked for by at this time asking Congressman Hechler if he cares to support the position of the president of the university.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have you here, Congressman Hechler.

STATEMENT OF HON. KEN HECHLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I certainly hope that the committee will favorably consider the two bills which will mean so much to West Virginia University and the land-grant colleges all over the Nation.

I believe that President Stahr quite dramatically illustrated the decline in Federal contributions since 1935 in percentage.

I certainly support the position taken by President Stahr and believe that this legislation will mean a great deal to the land-grant colleges and education all over the country.

Thank you.

Mr. BAILEY. In conclusion, let me thank you in advance for what I feel sure this committee will do in this matter.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you both very much.

We will next hear from Dr. Albin O. Kuhn, executive vice president of the University of Maryland.

STATEMENT OF DR. ALBIN O. KUHN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Dr. KUHN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a pleasure to be here. Our president would be here except that he is attending one of our graduation ceremonies and could not be here within the limits of time available.

I would like to illustrate rather briefly the effect of the growth at the University of Maryland, not because of the importance of the situation in Maryland, but rather as an illustration of the total situation.

In 1935, the university received \$70,000 in Federal funds as the land-grant institution. The University of Maryland is both the land-grant college and the State university for Maryland. That represented 17 percent of our total instructional budget on College Park and Princess Anne campuses.

Our total budget at that time was about \$500,000. This does not include any costs that are involved in support of the buildings, the construction of the buildings, the administration, but purely and simply deals with the cost, primarily, of keeping the professional faculty members in the classrooms.

By the year 1960 the budget for teaching purposes, specifically at the university, had increased to, approximately, \$7 million, and as to the percentage of Federal funds under the Land-Grant Act, it represented a decrease from 17 to 1.4 percent.

I think the one important thing that might be emphasized at this time is that every one of our institutions is facing a very large increase in enrollment.

During the period 1935 to 1960, in Maryland, the enrollment in undergraduate and graduate courses increased from about 2,000 students to 10,000 students.

We had the opportunity to make a very careful study of the problems that lay ahead during the next 10 years and the next 15 years in Maryland. And if this land-grant institution and State university does just one thing, that is, to meet the increasing percentage or number of students that come out of our high schools in the State it will in a 10-year period double the enrollment and it will in a 15-year period triple the present enrollment. There is a tremendous job for all of us to do.

We believe that these identical proposals would be of very material aid in helping to meet this need.

I will try to answer any questions that you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, and your entire statement will be made a part of the record at this point.

(The statement of Dr. Albin O. Kuhn, of the University of Maryland, follows:)

TESTIMONY BY DR. ALBIN O. KUHN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the University of Maryland is the land-grant college and the State university for Maryland. I appear before you to discuss briefly the growth that has taken place in the teaching responsibilities of the university in the period 1935 through 1960.

In 1935 the university received \$70,000 in Federal funds as the land-grant institution and at that time the total budget of the university for teaching responsibilities in agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto was \$415,803; thus the Federal appropriation was approximately 17 percent of the total teaching budget for this instruction.

In 1960 the university received Federal funds in the amount of \$93,372 and the total budget for instruction in the similar courses was \$6,825,315. Thus the portion of the instructional costs borne through Federal funds had reduced to approximately 1.4 percent of the total.

In the period 1935 through 1960 the enrollment at the university increased as follows:

Year	Full-time under-graduate enrollment	Full-time graduate enrollment	Total
1935	1,868	198	2,066
1960	9,276	802	10,078

A careful study of the increase in high school graduates in Maryland has led to what is believed to be a very conservative prediction that the enrollment at the University of Maryland will double by 1970 and triple by 1975. This projection ignores the increasing tendency for high school graduates to attend college and deals simply with the increasing numbers of students who will be graduated from high school.

The enrollment increases of recent years have been heavily in the areas of engineering, physics, chemistry, mathematics, and education. The university serves all segments of the population in Maryland and is facing a very difficult period of expansion in serving the needs of the State. The proposed adjustment of Federal funds to account for the increase in general population and the effects of inflation can be of tremendous aid in meeting this important challenge.

These data with respect to the University of Maryland are given simply to illustrate a problem that is national in scope.

Mr. POAGE. I want to ask Dr. Kuhn about the basis for Federal support. If I understand correctly, the original Land-Grant College Act contemplated that these institutions would be training grounds for our military forces?

Dr. KUHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. And it was on that basis that we started, on that basis the Federal Government had an interest in maintaining these colleges, as distinguished from the colleges directed toward fine arts or drama or something of that sort—that was the basis on which we selected these particular institutions?

Dr. KUHN. It is my understanding that was one of the bases.

In addition, it was instruction in agriculture, mechanic arts, and those associated subjects.

Mr. POAGE. Did we not at that time assume that the students would take mechanic arts and agriculture, and we would like to see them do so, we wanted to encourage that, but at the same time that they would be providing soldier material?

Dr. KUHN. That has been a continuing objective of land-grant colleges.

Mr. POAGE. What is the present law in regard to that—do all land-grant colleges at the present time maintain a military establishment?

Dr. KUHN. I would like to speak for Maryland. And I would like to defer to Mr. Thackrey for the broad picture over the country.

We not only maintain a military establishment—in our case it is an Air Force unit—but all of the freshmen and sophomores, the first 2 years of work, every male student who is physically fit is required to enter into that instruction.

Mr. POAGE. I know that you do maintain military training at Maryland. My question is, Do we now require that of all land-grant colleges?

Mr. THACKREY. May I answer that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. THACKREY. All land-grant institutions must offer military instruction. They do not have to require it. Most of them do require it.

Mr. POAGE. In other words, the students at a land-grant college are not necessarily required to take military instruction—but the institution must provide the instruction for those who do want it?

Mr. THACKREY. Yes, sir. And most of them still require it. It is emphasized in the first 2 years. A few do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I have been listening to the questions from the different members of the committee as they have been presented. And you have given figures for the period from 1935 to 1960. I wonder if it would be possible to put a chart into the record showing the enrollment in 1935 and the enrollment now, the appro-

priation in 1935 and the appropriation now. It seems to me that it would be very illuminative and would give the members some very valuable information, and the members would be able to see what their States are getting now and what they were getting then in percentage, that is, of the appropriation now and what it was then.

Dr. KUHN. I am sure that could be furnished.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is there any objection to that? I would like to have a chart included as to what they received in 1935 and what they get now.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you furnish that?

Mr. THACKREY. I have with me a chart showing the amount received in 1935 and the amounts proposed under this bill. I do not have with me information as to the amounts, but I can get that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. And would you show the schools and States that qualify?

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, a list of the land-grant colleges?

Mr. THACKREY. Yes, sir.

(The information is as follows:)

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND STATE UNIVERSITIES,
OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1960.

Representative H. A. DIXON,
Member of Congress from Utah,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. DIXON: In answer to your request for further clarification of the purposes for which Federal funds for instruction or materials for instruction in the land-grant institutions may be used, the following is submitted:

The Second Morrill Act of 1890 provided that funds available under it can be used only for instruction "in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic sciences, with special reference to their applications in the industries of life, and to the facilities for such instruction."

The Nelson amendment of 1907 increased the funds available under this act and specified that, in addition to the purposes named above, a portion of the money might be used "for providing courses for the special preparation of instructors for teaching the elements of agriculture and the mechanic arts."

Section 22 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 provides that the funds authorized under it must be used for the same purposes as specified in the Second Morrill Act of 1890, as amended by the Nelson amendment of 1907. The legislation proposed by Mr. Cooley and yourself would continue this requirement. None of the funds may be used for buildings, sites for buildings, or for land; nor may they be used for salaries of purely administrative, clerical, and other nonteaching staff. They may not be used for salaries of instructors in philosophy, psychology, ethics, logic, history, civil government, military science and tactics, and in ancient and modern languages (except English).

In order that greater uniformity might be secured in the use of the funds, the U.S. Office of Education some years ago prepared a classification of subjects that may be included under the several subject areas designated by the Congress in the basic legislation.

I will not burden you with the complete list of subjects, which may be found in Bulletin 1952, No. 21, U.S. Office of Education, pages 16-17, but the major headings are as follows:

1. Instruction in agriculture (various headings are listed).
2. Instruction in mechanic arts (various fields and subjects are listed, including the major branches of engineering).
3. Instruction in English language.
4. Instruction in natural and physical sciences.
5. Instruction in economic sciences (including political economy and home economics).

6. Special preparation of teachers (specific vocational courses are listed, but general courses are excluded).

From the U.S. Office of Education I have obtained the following summary of reports from the land-grant institutions for the year ended June 30, 1959 (the latest available year), showing the actual purposes for which the funds were expended in that year.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL I. THACKREY,
Executive Secretary.

Expenditures of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds, by field, year ended June 30, 1959 (from Federal funds appropriated for instruction at land-grant colleges and universities)

State (1)	Expenditures			Expenditures by subject-matter field							Special preparation of teachers (11)
	Total (2)	Salaries (3)	Facilities (4)	Agriculture (5)	Mechanic arts (6)	English language (7)	Mathematical science (8)	Natural and physical science (9)	Economic science (10)		
Total.....	\$5,051,622.73	\$4,919,805.82	\$131,816.91	\$792,445.73	\$1,415,823.04	\$656,806.11	\$446,076.24	\$1,342,139.65	\$370,883.59	\$27,448.37	
Alabama 1.....	100,541.43	94,349.43	6,192.00	2 14,577.00	2 30,502.00	2 19,868.43	8,560.00	2 19,713.00	7,321.00	-----	
Alaska.....	71,283.24	71,283.24	-----	1,422.00	15,841.16	10,113.45	9,441.22	19,943.77	14,521.64	-----	
Arizona.....	77,464.26	77,464.26	-----	-----	-----	25,632.26	-----	44,560.00	7,272.00	-----	
Arkansas 1.....	89,047.71	88,415.65	632.06	2 9,338.48	2 15,646.97	9,733.00	4,199.98	39,695.98	10,383.30	-----	
California.....	175,599.47	175,599.47	-----	23,400.00	51,300.00	-----	-----	75,699.47	16,800.00	8,400.00	
Colorado.....	83,218.00	83,218.00	-----	-----	16,634.63	26,393.97	16,783.15	23,406.25	-----	-----	
Connecticut.....	90,008.98	90,008.98	-----	11,087.00	20,520.00	16,200.00	6,240.00	27,501.98	8,460.00	-----	
Delaware 1.....	73,172.96	68,433.29	4,739.67	13,270.00	14,502.59	30,149.68	5,781.10	7,999.92	1,469.67	-----	
Florida 1.....	98,065.51	98,065.51	-----	25,000.13	18,328.88	12,101.00	35,452.50	7,183.00	-----	-----	
Georgia 1.....	104,360.28	104,360.28	-----	51,200.28	8,750.00	6,800.00	8,000.00	17,500.00	8,860.00	3,250.00	
Hawaii.....	75,460.99	75,460.99	-----	-----	5,856.00	-----	13,168.70	20,367.52	36,068.77	-----	
Idaho.....	75,871.76	75,871.76	-----	30,903.76	17,176.00	45,913.51	17,492.00	18,942.00	8,850.00	-----	
Illinois.....	156,905.51	156,905.51	-----	-----	30,328.00	63,172.00	-----	48,140.59	-----	-----	
Indiana.....	109,244.59	109,244.59	-----	7,104.00	54,000.00	-----	5,673.00	10,923.00	9,847.00	-----	
Iowa.....	96,145.67	96,145.67	-----	27,831.00	23,286.67	18,585.00	9,992.00	20,227.00	15,934.00	-----	
Kansas.....	89,005.70	89,005.70	-----	-----	25,731.70	2,100.00	2,000.00	2,400.00	3,890.00	630.50	
Kentucky 1.....	99,374.97	99,374.97	-----	28,610.87	59,743.60	13,706.28	14,631.00	18,523.85	8,413.92	-----	
Louisiana 1.....	96,768.55	96,768.55	-----	28,128.75	13,364.75	13,706.28	14,631.00	23,316.36	9,608.87	-----	
Maine.....	79,115.06	79,115.06	-----	4,956.70	26,449.03	8,451.52	6,332.58	23,316.36	9,000.00	-----	
Maryland 1.....	93,371.85	93,371.85	-----	9,499.00	-----	23,000.00	12,000.00	40,872.85	8,000.00	-----	
Massachusetts 1.....	116,788.72	116,622.72	166.00	1,782.82	2 29,078.00	12,872.00	13,984.67	40,441.23	18,630.00	-----	
Michigan.....	133,559.50	133,559.50	-----	14,700.00	38,940.00	-----	-----	76,819.50	3,100.00	-----	
Minnesota.....	99,750.80	99,750.80	-----	13,277.00	31,311.00	11,409.00	12,337.00	12,905.00	14,540.80	3,971.00	
Mississippi 1.....	91,735.06	91,735.06	-----	6,009.00	20,047.00	17,209.80	10,144.21	22,329.23	14,215.82	1,750.00	
Missouri 1.....	109,446.30	103,365.96	6,080.34	2 9,289.25	2 65,123.47	9,274.90	2 2,723.14	2 19,467.41	2 3,207.26	2 330.87	
Montana.....	75,895.57	75,895.57	-----	13,874.94	22,029.13	8,075.00	5,833.30	15,666.60	10,416.60	-----	
Nebraska.....	83,222.20	83,222.20	-----	-----	83,222.20	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Nevada.....	71,593.86	71,593.86	-----	6,770.12	23,015.00	4,511.68	28,156.31	9,143.75	9,619.18	-----	
New Hampshire.....	75,319.18	75,319.18	-----	-----	21,500.00	36,500.00	-----	7,700.00	5,000.00	-----	
New Jersey.....	118,233.27	118,233.27	-----	31,000.00	20,000.00	18,000.00	8,000.00	33,233.27	5,700.00	-----	
New Mexico.....	76,794.96	76,728.00	66.96	2 24,284.96	20,244.00	6,108.00	4,608.00	15,850.00	-----	-----	
New York.....	217,188.69	216,305.03	-----	2 86,428.40	97,760.29	25,000.00	-----	8,000.00	1,500.00	2,000.00	
North Carolina 1.....	110,518.47	110,518.47	6,883.66	32,500.00	50,000.37	7,047.00	10,000.00	7,471.10	7,300.72	-----	
North Dakota.....	76,180.98	76,180.98	-----	-----	60,934.43	-----	-----	7,945.83	-----	-----	

Ohio.....	149,269.02	149,209.02	62,503.00	41,992.24	20,856.00	8,847.76	9,400.00	-----
Oklahoma ¹	92,278.07	92,278.07	13,000.00	3,000.00	12,943.00	24,406.27	9,400.00	-----
Oregon.....	85,175.65	85,175.65	16,600.00	3,175.65	5,200.00	22,300.00	9,900.00	-----
Pennsylvania.....	174,719.55	174,719.55	62,004.00	23,356.00	9,392.00	68,963.55	-----	-----
Puerto Rico.....	50,000.21	50,000.21	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Rhode Island.....	77,899.30	77,899.30	19,417.00	9,132.00	13,125.00	16,332.00	7,172.00	-----
South Carolina ¹	91,117.72	91,117.72	35,253.72	15,148.00	13,214.00	9,752.00	6,250.00	5,500.00
South Dakota.....	76,511.20	76,511.20	27,166.64	11,978.00	11,888.88	25,477.68	-----	-----
Tennessee ¹	102,835.48	98,175.48	² 13,564.71	² 8,500.00	² 15,000.00	² 40,800.00	² 7,586.00	1,586.00
Texas ¹	146,920.54	54,053.40	² 34,005.00	-----	-----	² 75,150.54	² 306.00	-----
Utah.....	76,871.52	76,871.52	7,700.04	18,616.44	12,050.04	14,499.96	15,875.04	-----
Vermont.....	73,768.09	73,768.09	9,641.24	-----	14,726.85	16,000.00	15,500.00	-----
Virginia ¹	103,104.43	103,104.43	18,000.00	12,731.15	12,949.11	23,776.64	11,881.38	-----
Washington.....	93,730.58	93,730.58	29,119.10	40,351.63	-----	53,378.95	-----	-----
West Virginia.....	90,005.74	88,038.24	-----	² 10,304.52	15,666.50	² 64,034.72	² 4,564.62	-----
Wisconsin.....	104,260.50	96,668.92	-----	-----	8,500.00	17,506.04	-----	-----
Wyoming.....	72,898.08	72,898.08	46,322.96	16,644.00	8,914.00	33,852.08	13,488.00	-----

¹ Includes expenditures for the 2 land-grant institutions in this State.² Includes expenditures for facilities.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, Apr. 26, 1960.

The CHAIRMAN. We will next call Mr. James Corley, vice president, the University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, we have been acquainted with Mr. Corley's management for a good many years. He has many, many, thousands of students under his wing. He has done a splendid job and is continuing to do a splendid job in the University of California.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have you here.

STATEMENT OF JAMES CORLEY, VICE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CALIF.

Mr. CORLEY. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I might say that this is my maiden voyage before a congressional committee, although I have appeared before the State legislature.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very glad to have you here.

Mr. CORLEY. Briefly, I will not repeat what has been said by the previous speakers, but we endorse the legislation that is before you.

The University of California, in an effort to bring the cost factors of 1935 up to 1960, has gone into that subject. As you know, California is an agricultural State. We have courses in agriculture given at four of your institutions in California. The principles of the Morrill Act, and the Bankhead-Jones Act, have been established years ago. And the University of California being the land-grant institution in California has been devoting its attention to agriculture as one of its main subjects for all of its existence.

With the growth in California we believe that the support for additional funds for education in agriculture, both at the undergraduate and graduate level is essential. We are experiencing growth in our agricultural enrollment and we feel that additional funds will be most helpful in our future program of development of the University in the State.

We believe, and I recommend to you approval of the legislation, in bringing the cost factors up to the population growth and the cost-of-living growth.

That is all I have to say to you, and I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Which are the four institutions in California?

Mr. CORLEY. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Davis and Riverside.

Davis is primarily the agricultural school at the moment, although Riverside is an experiment station in agriculture. The largest number of agricultural students are at Davis.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much again.

Mr. CORLEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will next hear from President William E. Morgan, of Colorado State University. We are happy to have you here.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. MORGAN, PRESIDENT, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, ours is the land-grant institution in the State of Colorado.

My name is William E. Morgan. I am president of Colorado State University, which is the land-grant institution in that State. I too wish to thank you and your committee for permitting me to appear in support of H.R. 10876 and H.R.10974, which would amend section 22 of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 by bringing the allocation of land-grant teaching funds from Federal sources up to the equivalent of effectiveness achieved in the year 1935, the date when the Congress last acted on this matter.

Testimony previously given by my colleagues from other States has dealt with the basic reasons for urging your favorable consideration of this proposal. Beyond indicating my agreement with the line of reasoning followed in that testimony, I shall not reiterate the argument already covered. Instead, I should like to emphasize one feature of these land-grant institutions that is especially pertinent to the subject of Federal assistance in financing the operation of the land-grant system.

This distinctive feature is the extent to which these institutions fulfill national and regional educational needs, as contrasted with the State and local character of their management, their financing, and their operations.

These are State institutions, and virtually all of their support comes from State sources. It is understandable that a State wishes to afford all its young people the opportunity for choice of collegiate level training embracing all specialized fields. If, however, a State is obliged to become self-sufficient in the full spectrum of advanced training, it could do so only at prohibitive cost even for the richer and more heavily populated States. But it is not so much the individual State that would suffer from such a high-cost educational operation as would the Nation in its loss of manpower potential when some of its young people lack the opportunity to pursue training in an uncommon field.

Between them, these land-grant institutions have developed high quality programs in a wide variety of fields; but at any one institution the areas of intensive specialization have been limited by local conditions, including restricted capabilities of finance and personnel. By this process the land-grant system has been made strong, but only at the expense of a certain degree of academic isolation for the individual States. This calls to the maximum possible extent for unhampered movement of people across State boundaries. Federal financial assistance has been available since 1890 to smooth out the interstate financial difficulties that are inherent in such a complex pattern of supply and demand for educational requirements.

The institution I represent may be cited as an example of this proposition. We enroll 6,000 students. On our campus is located one of the three colleges of veterinary medicine found in the 11 Western States, one of the three colleges of forestry, one of two training programs in occupational therapy, and the only comprehensive graduate program in fluid mechanics. Of the 6,000 students, 27 percent come from out of the State. All but one of the States are represented in the student body, as are 22 foreign countries.

These out-of-State students pay an extra tuition, but the amount of such tuition falls far short of the cost of instruction.

Mr. POAGE. How much is it?

Mr. MORGAN. The tuition fee is \$510, paid by out-of-State students.

Mr. POAGE. How about those within the State?

Mr. MORGAN. The in-State is \$210.

Mr. DIXON. Your cost per student is much more than \$500?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir. And I get to that in a moment.

More specifically, in the school year just ending, out-of-State tuition paid by a student on our campus covered only 57 percent of the average cost of his instruction, not counting capital facility charges. If this analysis were applied to the graduate level where out-of-State enrollments are unusually heavy and where student costs invariably are the highest on the campus, the margin of difference would, of course, be greater still.

I realize that we are dealing with a philosophical subject here, Mr. Chairman.

The difference between cost to the student and cost to the institution represents, in a sense, the price paid by the institution for promoting free trade in ideas between the States and for encouraging high mobility among people engaged in the creative activity of instruction and research.

This is commonsense application to education of a principle so fundamental to the development of national strength that it is threaded throughout the text of the Constitution of the United States. The principle finds expression in the constitutional provisions under which Congress itself regulates commerce between the States, under which the States are restrained from erecting barriers to trade or from entering into compacts with each other without the consent of Congress, and under which the citizens of each State are entitled to the privilege and immunities of citizens in the several States.

Thus, the request before you is a request for partial support of this self-evident contribution to national strength made by these land-grant institutions as they fulfill the role of regional training institutions without regard to State boundaries.

Thank you, sir, for the opportunity to be here.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We are glad to have your statement.

Mr. SHORT. Did I understand you to say that the college is the land-grant institution?

Mr. CORLEY. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. Thank you.

Mr. DIXON. I very much appreciated your line of reasoning which shows quite definitely the difference in aid in this situation and general Federal aid for the States.

You have mentioned quite well that these land-grant institutions are regional, and that some of the States are sacrificing unduly for the regional benefit and for the national benefit, when they cannot afford it.

Could you give us an idea of what percent of your budget was contributed by the Federal contribution in 1935 and what the percentage is today?

Mr. CORLEY. The percentage borne by the Federal funds under the Bankhead-Jones Act, or, rather, under the Morrill Act of 1890, before the Bankhead-Jones Act funds became available in 1935, was about 6 percent.

This past year our resident instruction operating budget at our institution was about \$4,200,000. The Federal funds available under this legislation were \$83,000. The figure would be, approximately, 2 percent.

Mr. DIXON. I was anxious to get the figures as to what these students do contribute. I know that you have the only veterinarian school in the intermountain territory. You also mentioned forestry. And you have a water resource laboratory, do you not?

Mr. CORLEY. That is right, sir.

Mr. DIXON. Which serves the whole West. What other departments, like those expensive departments, benefit the entire region?

Mr. CORLEY. Our out-of-State regional enrollment tends to be concentrated in the colleges of veterinary medicine, the college of forestry, the college of agriculture. It is lower in the college of home economics.

Most of the students there come from within the State. And it is lower in the college of science and arts. But with the development of technology, Mr. Dixon—I want to call you President Dixon—a former colleague in this region—the colleges of science and or arts have tended to supply much of the technical training that just a generation ago was found, say, in the college of agriculture.

Let me illustrate it with one example. In the last 25 years a great deal that we did not know before has been found out about the basic explanation of nutrition, animal nutrition and plant nutrition, too.

The people who have done much of this work have been biochemists. It is not unusual now to find members of animal husbandry departments on these land-grant institutions whose training was not in animal husbandry, but whose training came out of biochemistry. As a matter of fact, on our own campus the head of our department of animal husbandry is a biochemist. He is an expert in animal nutrition.

It is the technological development in these sciences that has handed to obliterate these departmental lines that formerly were so clearly drawn to differentiate a college of agriculture from a college of engineering, let us say. Now we find that the university is not, as I guess it is, as has been demonstrated in the research laboratories, that departmental lines mean much less than they did even when you were at Utah State, Dr. Dixon. This rapid development has been in the last decade which has tended to accelerate this development.

Mr. DIXON. That is why it would be difficult, I guess, to go on the basis of full time students—you could not segregate the students in the mechanical arts and agriculture from the students in the other courses.

Mr. CORLEY. The distinction as to the major courses of studies that the students are taking become less pertinent. For example, graduates from our department of physics, mechanical engineering, chemistry and mathematics, just to pick out four, find their life's work in the field of agriculture and supporting industry and research that contributes to the economic development that just a generation ago we described as agriculture. But now it is all mixed up. It is together.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I think that the West, certainly owes a great debt of gratitude to Colorado State University.

Mr. CORLEY. Thank you.

Mr. DIXON. For the pioneering work it has done for the economy of the Nation. And I want to thank you, President Morgan.

Mr. POAGE. I think that I understand what you are saying about the breakdown of the sharp lines which formerly held. I think I understand that.

You explained that very well. And any money that comes in by way of this legislation is going to actually be used pretty generally and is going to have the effect of subsidizing students who graduate in Shakespeare as well as those who graduate in animal husbandry.

Mr. CORLEY. To a limited extent, yes, sir, but it does go to the institution that the State has designated as the land-grant institution.

Mr. POAGE. You give degrees in history and in English and in social sciences—you give degrees on practically everything at the University of California.

Mr. CORLEY. There are some fields where we do not, but in many areas yes, sir, that is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And this money would not simply be used for agriculture and engineering, would it?

Mr. CORLEY. The language of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 is the guideline on this, sir. And this is a quotation from the act of 1890, the original act, and it says:

That the appropriation is to be applied only to instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural and economic science with special reference to their application in the industries and to the facilities for such construction.

Mr. POAGE. You mentioned history—what does history mean to you in this context?

Mr. CORLEY. What this means to me is that these institutions, created under the act of 1862 were for primarily a vocational objective. They were to train people to make a living, but at the same time they were suppose to be educated. That clearly is in the basic legislation signed by Mr. Lincoln in 1862.

I think Will Rogers expressed it in one short sentence better than I can with a whole page of words when he said that:

“Education is a fine thing and every college graduate ought to have one.”

The student who graduates in agriculture and whose surroundings are so limited that he cannot brush up against English literature or even Shakespeare and use it and philosophy and economics and sociology, he may not be as well educated as he might have been had those courses been available to him. This is not to say that the major sectors of instruction in these technical areas are watered down by feeding in and diverting these students' attention in the areas that are not closely associated with his technical field, but every college faculty that I know of strives to find room in the curriculum for the technical courses that march of science requires them to have, and yet they want to save some space for some of the liberal education.

That is the language, by the way, of the original land grant act.

So, really, this black and white distinction that we need to make for some purposes in describing colleges of agriculture as contrasted with another type of college—these black and white distinctions melt into grays in between.

The important thing is to develop on a campus an institution that shall provide in great depth the type of training and these technical fields require that are prescribed in this basic legislation and at the same time offer the environment of these other courses.

Mr. POAGE. I do not find any fault with that type of education at all. Unfortunately, I never attended a land grant college. I think I understand the importance of liberal arts, but from the standpoint of maintaining this type of Federal aid we will have to confine it, or rather restrict it, or we will have to accept the philosophy of the Federal Government taking over our educational institutions.

Mr. CORLEY. Mr. Poage, I would say that this legislation, the basic structure of it is already defined in the Bankhead-Jones Act and in the earlier act, and limits the support to particular institutions.

Mr. POAGE. And we do it on the theory that these particular institutions are contributing in some particular way to the United States of America's posterity and well-being as distinguished from the State of Colorado and the State of Texas.

Mr. CORLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. And even in 1862, I think it was pretty well evident that the sponsors of this legislation recognized that they could not get enough support to pass it unless they moved it out under the cover of the flag and the uniform. And that is what they did.

I am not criticizing that. I think that it was a good thing. But they put the uniform on the boy they were going to subsidize.

Mr. CORLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. They, probably did it, just exactly like we do when we pass legislation today, because they had to do it to pass it. They knew that they could not pass a bill to simply subsidize all college education. Is that not the reason that they did it?

Mr. CORLEY. I have read the history of this legislation, Mr. Poage, only recently. And this is the story that I get. This philosophy of support of an educational institution, none of which existed back there in the early 19th century, that would afford the opportunity for a higher education to the sons and daughters of the people who generally had no such opportunity.

This philosophy found expression in legislation that passed the Congress in 1858 and was vetoed by President Buchanan in a very sharply worded veto. It was passed again in 1862. I really think that the military feature incorporated in it was truly secondary.

Mr. POAGE. I think it is secondary, too. I think it was put in there in order to pass it. I think it is quite clear that they could not pass it without it.

Mr. CORLEY. Was it in the 1858 act?

Mr. THACKREY. No.

Mr. POAGE. It was vetoed, though, was it not?

Mr. CORLEY. Not on the basis of the military feature. The pattern, the time of the day, in which this act was passed, in 1862 were that the Civil War was underway. Here was a proposal to set aside 30,000 acres out of the public domain for each Member of the Congress for each of these States, if they would establish a college and use this land as part of their permanent endowment. That was the philosophy of the thing, let us take this western public domain and endow it to the creation of colleges of a particular kind.

All of the States, by the way, except Texas, which retained its own lands, obtained Federal lands out of the public domain for this purpose. I mean no censure of Texas. It is my native State. As a matter of fact, I graduated from Texas A. & M. at the same time that you were at the University of Texas. So I feel very strongly the Texas history in connection with this.

All of the rest of the States, however, obtained their land under this grant of 30,000 acres for each Member of Congress and then they were permitted to sell the land, as most of the States back East did, because they had no opportunity to manage it, or if they were Western States, as we were, they sold part of the land and kept part of the land.

In the case of Colorado 90,000 acres in the public domain were originally granted to the State, and some 60,000 acres were sold and 30,000 acres still remain in our land grant as land in our State.

So our income out of the original endowment in our State comes in part from bonds bought with the investment from the funds realized when the land was sold, and part comes from grazing rentals and an occasional mineral lease.

The total income from that original allotment in our State is about \$22,000 a year.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am a bit puzzled as to the trend toward changing the names of agricultural colleges. Most of them, I think, started out as agricultural colleges to teach agriculture and mechanical arts. Now they all want to become universities.

Mr. CORLEY. I should, certainly, respond to that in terms of our own situation, because this is one I know. And since we are a State that went through this exercise, I should like to respond to the statement.

In our institution about 18 percent of its graduates came from the College of Agriculture. This was true even during the time of World War I.

As we have moved into the 1960's, the proportion of our graduates now coming out of the College of Agriculture is about 14 or 15 percent, that is to say, many of our graduates who 20 years ago would have graduated with a degree in agriculture, now are going into the same vocation that they would have gone into 20 years ago, but they are majoring in chemistry, to use the example that I made a moment ago—they intend to go into the livestock feed supply business. Their degree could just as well have been labeled "animal husbandry," but their major emphasis was in nutrition, so that they took their degree in biochemistry, let us say.

There has been this widespread change in the technology of agriculture and of engineering and of the other sciences that has been accelerated very rapidly in the last 20 years. And thus our graduates who in the modern scene leave the campus and travel all over the world, that is, today, just a generation ago, most of them left the campus and settled down within a few hundred miles of the campus in the State or in the immediate vicinity, where the name of our institution was well known. But when you come back East or go overseas the name of our institution which was the College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts, was a misnomer for some 80 percent of the graduates.

This change was made to reflect the true nature of the institution. Its basic purpose has not changed through the years at all.

Whether this is the experience in other States, I do not know, sir.

Mr. HOEVEN. And by the same token, when you have more than one State institution you have quite a different situation.

Mr. CORLEY. There has been no invasion of that kind.

Mr. HOEVEN. I object to one institution infringing on the rights and prerogatives of another institution.

Mr. CORLEY. This has not been the case at our State university, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we thank you.

Mr. PIRNIE. I have just one question. I want to make the observation that there was one feature in which the original responsibility of the land-grant college has been very effectively discharged, and that was to conduct military training, and is it not a fact that through that system the Armed Forces received a major officer supply, so that you have had the responsibility in the leadership of educating them?

Mr. CORLEY. Yes, sir. The Department of Defense figures, which I cannot quote from memory show that in the officer corps of World War II very large numbers came from these institutions.

Mr. PIRNIE. And you are continuously feeding into the Reserves, are you not, a substantial number of Reserve officers?

Mr. CORLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PIRNIE. That is, from your institution and from the land-grant colleges as a whole?

Mr. CORLEY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. PIRNIE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you again.

We will now hear from Dr. Louis A. Pardue, vice president and dean of the Graduate School, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

Mr. McINTIRE. Before Dr. Pardue begins, may I state for the record that I have received a communication from Dr. Lloyd Elliott, president of the University of Maine, land-grant college, in support of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir. We are very glad to have that information for the record.

Mr. GRANT. And along that line, Mr. Chairman, may I state that I have received a communication from Dr. Ralph Draughon, president of Auburn University, the land-grant college in Alabama, in support of this legislation?

Mr. BREEDING. I would like to ask permission to insert into the record a letter from Dr. McCain of Kansas State University at Manhattan, Kans.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that may be done.

(The letter follows:)

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE,
Manhattan, Kans., May 27, 1960.

HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING,
U.S. Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BREEDING: I heartily support H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 which are designed to bring the allocation of land-grant teaching funds from Federal sources up to their equivalent of effectiveness in 1935, the last time an adjustment was made.

As you know, passage of this legislation has been recommended unanimously by the Senate of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State

Universities to compensate the land-grant institutions for inflation and population growth which they have experienced during the past 25 years.

I enthusiastically endorse the statement by Dr. John T. Caldwell, chairman of the Land-Grant Association Legislative Committee, in his communication of February 23, 1960 to Hon. Harold Cooley, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

I greatly appreciate your support of this legislation in behalf of Kansas State University and the other land-grant institutions as well.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. MCCAIN, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Mr. Pardue.

**STATEMENT OF DR. LOUIS A. PARDUE, VICE PRESIDENT AND DEAN
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
BLACKSBURG, VA.**

Dr. PARDUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Louis A. Pardue, and I am vice president of Virginia Polytechnic Institute at Blacksburg, Va.

I appreciate this opportunity to make a brief statement.

My institution is a member of the land-grant system, and, admittedly, would be one of the beneficiaries of these bills under consideration, but I feel that the bills have so much justification that those of us who receive direct support from them may give advocacy to them without being motivated entirely by self-interest. In fact, their merit places them in obligation to point out their need and fairness.

We share the convictions of Chancellor Caldwell, which he so ably presented to the committee, but will not take your time to restate them. They have been so well stated that I am sure that the committee is aware of their cogency.

Perhaps it would add something to the reasons why these bills are necessary now and are, in fact, overdue, if I would give a few facts about our institution.

During the first 5 years of the Bankhead-Jones Act, starting in 1935, we received, approximately, 4 percent of our instructional budget from the act. During the last 5 years, we have received less than 1½ percent.

So the effect of the act has diminished considerably.

During the interval, between the early years of it and the later years, our enrollment has increased from just under 2,000 to over 5,000, and the support for students has decreased from about \$12 a year to nearly one-half this figure.

If the bills presently before Congress should fail of passage, the deterioration of Federal support of instruction—and we believe this is an obligation of the Federal Government to the land-grant institutions—this deterioration will increase markedly because our gross curve in enrollment and overall instructional budget is rising sharply from 5 to 10 percent a year.

I might point out that our graduate work and research work are growing at an even higher rate.

Our graduate enrollment has gone up by a factor of 4 in the interval between 1935 and to date. There is a shift, too, to the more expensive instruction. Our classes now are nearly equal. There was a time when the freshman class, the least expensive class, was much larger, but

our senior classes are about as large as our freshman class, and our graduate enrollment has added to our senior enrollment.

This combination is larger than our freshman enrollment; our sophomore class, a relatively inexpensive class, is the smallest class we have in the institution.

A thoroughly constant Bankhead-Jones support would make it necessary for our other sources of support to increase their contributions. This could only be justified if support is less appropriate now than it was in 1935.

We respectfully suggest that this situation is by no means true.

Thank you for letting me make this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Did you want to say something, Mr. Thackrey?

Mr. THACKREY. I believe at the last meeting of the committee you requested a table showing present allocation of the bills, that is, under the two tables.

The CHAIRMAN. Please give it to the reporter for inclusion in the record at this point.

(The material requested previously and referred to above follows:)

PRESENT

Federal annual appropriations¹ for instruction at land-grant colleges and universities

State	Variable grants	Total grants	State	Variable grants	Total grants
Alabama ²	\$30,541.43	\$100,541.43	Nebraska	\$13,222.20	\$83,222.20
Alaska	1,283.24	71,283.24	Nevada	1,596.86	71,596.86
Arizona	7,477.26	77,477.26	New Hampshire	5,319.18	75,319.18
Arkansas ²	19,047.71	89,047.71	New Jersey	48,233.27	118,233.27
California	105,599.47	175,599.47	New Mexico	6,794.96	76,794.96
Colorado	13,218.00	83,218.00	New York	147,933.81	217,933.81
Connecticut	20,022.98	90,022.98	North Carolina ²	40,518.47	110,518.47
Delaware ²	3,172.96	73,172.96	North Dakota	6,180.98	76,180.98
Florida ²	27,644.26	97,644.26	Ohio	79,269.02	149,269.02
Georgia ²	34,360.28	104,360.28	Oklahoma ²	22,278.07	92,278.07
Hawaii	4,985.53	74,985.53	Oregon	15,175.65	85,175.65
Idaho	5,871.76	75,871.76	Pennsylvania	104,719.55	174,719.55
Illinois	86,905.51	156,905.51	Puerto Rico ³		50,000.00
Indiana	39,244.59	109,244.59	Rhode Island	7,899.30	77,899.30
Iowa	26,145.67	96,145.67	South Carolina ²	21,117.72	91,117.72
Kansas	19,005.70	89,005.70	South Dakota	6,511.20	76,511.20
Kentucky ²	29,374.97	99,374.97	Tennessee ²	32,835.48	102,835.48
Louisiana ²	26,768.55	96,768.55	Texas ²	76,920.54	146,920.54
Maine	9,115.06	79,115.06	Utah	6,871.52	76,871.52
Maryland ²	23,371.85	93,371.85	Vermont	3,768.09	73,768.09
Massachusetts	46,788.72	116,788.72	Virginia ²	33,104.43	103,104.43
Michigan	63,559.50	133,559.50	Washington	23,730.58	93,730.58
Minnesota	29,750.80	99,750.80	West Virginia ²	20,005.74	90,005.74
Mississippi ²	21,735.06	91,735.06	Wisconsin	34,260.50	104,260.50
Missouri ²	39,448.37	109,448.37	Wyoming	2,898.08	72,898.08
Montana	5,895.57	75,895.57			
			Total	1,501,500.00	5,051,500.00

¹ Uniform grants to each State, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico from 2d Morrill Act, 1890 (\$25,000); Nelson amendment, 1907 (\$25,000); and uniform grants to each State, Alaska, and Hawaii from Bankhead-Jones Act, 1935, as amended June 1952 (\$20,000); total for each, \$70,000.

² The Negro land-grant college in this State receives a stipulated proportion of funds.

³ Puerto Rico does not participate in appropriations authorized by the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended June 1952.

NOTE.—Variable grants from Bankhead-Jones Act as amended June 1952, as indicated in this tabulation being a distribution of \$1,501,500 on basis of population, 1950.

The 2d Morrill Act and the Nelson amendment make continuing appropriations. The Bankhead-Jones Act authorizes appropriations; the appropriations are made annually by the Congress.

PROPOSED

Allotment of funds to States and territories for land-grant colleges and universities (colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts)—In accordance with provisions of H.R. 10876 (Representative Cooley), Mar. 3, 1960

State or territory	Total	Morrill-Nelson funds ¹	Bankhead-Jones funds			
			Total	Uniform grants	Variable grants ² (1950 census)	Variable grants (on basis of 1958 census estimates)
Total.....	\$14,500,000.00	\$2,550,000	\$11,950,000.00	\$7,650,000	\$4,300,000.00	\$4,300,000
Alabama ²	286,198.67	50,000	236,198.67	150,000	86,198.67	78,690
Alaska.....	203,621.75	50,000	153,621.75	150,000	3,621.75	3,870
Arizona.....	221,103.47	50,000	171,103.47	150,000	21,103.47	26,230
Arkansas ³	253,759.35	50,000	203,759.35	150,000	53,759.35	43,430
California.....	498,038.83	50,000	448,038.83	150,000	298,038.83	348,300
Colorado.....	237,305.84	50,000	187,305.84	150,000	37,305.84	40,780
Connecticut.....	256,511.88	50,000	206,511.88	150,000	56,511.88	55,600
Delaware ³	208,955.19	50,000	158,955.19	150,000	8,955.19	10,750
Florida ³	278,021.83	50,000	228,021.83	150,000	78,021.83	110,940
Georgia ³	296,976.80	50,000	246,976.80	150,000	96,976.80	92,880
Hawaii.....	214,070.93	50,000	164,070.93	150,000	14,070.93	13,860
Idaho.....	216,572.17	50,000	166,572.17	150,000	16,572.17	16,000
Illinois.....	445,277.92	50,000	395,277.92	150,000	245,277.92	249,400
Indiana.....	310,762.03	50,000	260,762.03	150,000	110,762.03	113,950
Iowa.....	273,792.28	50,000	223,792.28	150,000	73,792.28	68,500
Kansas.....	253,640.76	50,000	203,640.76	150,000	53,640.76	51,600
Kentucky ³	282,906.48	50,000	232,906.48	150,000	82,906.48	76,110
Louisiana ³	275,550.27	50,000	225,550.27	150,000	75,550.27	76,970
Maine.....	225,725.90	50,000	175,725.90	150,000	25,725.90	23,220
Maryland ³	265,963.59	50,000	215,963.59	150,000	65,963.59	72,670
Massachusetts ³	332,054.21	50,000	282,054.21	150,000	132,054.21	120,490
Michigan.....	379,387.27	50,000	329,387.27	150,000	179,387.27	193,500
Minnesota.....	283,967.22	50,000	233,967.22	150,000	83,967.22	81,700
Mississippi ³	261,343.97	50,000	211,343.97	150,000	61,343.97	53,750
Missouri ³	311,337.17	50,000	261,337.17	150,000	111,337.17	103,200
Montana.....	216,639.37	50,000	166,639.37	150,000	16,639.37	16,770
Nebraska.....	237,317.70	50,000	187,317.70	150,000	37,317.70	35,660
Nevada.....	204,506.89	50,000	154,506.89	150,000	4,506.89	6,450
New Hampshire.....	215,012.61	50,000	165,012.61	150,000	15,012.61	14,190
New Jersey.....	336,131.25	50,000	286,131.25	150,000	136,131.25	144,050
New Mexico.....	219,177.77	50,000	169,177.77	150,000	19,177.77	18,050
New York.....	617,521.26	50,000	567,521.26	150,000	417,521.26	408,500
North Carolina ³	314,357.36	50,000	264,357.36	150,000	114,357.36	110,080
North Dakota.....	217,444.90	50,000	167,444.90	150,000	17,444.90	16,000
Ohio.....	423,725.06	50,000	373,725.06	150,000	223,725.06	238,650
Oklahoma ³	262,876.56	50,000	212,876.56	150,000	62,876.56	55,470
Oregon.....	242,831.02	50,000	192,831.02	150,000	42,831.02	43,430
Pennsylvania.....	495,555.39	50,000	445,555.39	150,000	295,555.39	281,220
Puerto Rico.....	262,238.94	50,000	212,238.94	150,000	62,238.94	55,900
Rhode Island.....	222,294.61	50,000	172,294.61	150,000	22,294.61	20,640
South Carolina ³	259,601.64	50,000	209,601.64	150,000	59,601.64	58,480
South Dakota.....	218,376.89	50,000	168,376.89	150,000	18,376.89	16,500
Tennessee ³	292,673.26	50,000	242,673.26	150,000	92,673.26	86,430
Texas ³	417,096.81	50,000	367,096.81	150,000	217,096.81	230,050
Utah.....	219,393.85	50,000	169,393.85	150,000	19,393.85	21,070
Vermont.....	210,634.89	50,000	160,634.89	150,000	10,634.89	9,030
Virginia ³	293,432.33	50,000	243,432.33	150,000	93,432.33	93,500
Washington.....	266,976.02	50,000	216,976.02	150,000	66,976.02	64,500
West Virginia.....	256,463.26	50,000	206,463.26	150,000	56,463.26	49,450
Wisconsin.....	296,695.18	50,000	246,695.18	150,000	96,695.18	98,900
Wyoming.....	208,179.40	50,000	158,179.40	150,000	8,179.40	7,740

¹ Not amended by H.R. 10876.

² Based on "U.S. Census of Population: 1950," "In the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico, as determined by the last decennial census."

³ 2 land-grant institutions in this State receive a stipulated proportion of the funds allotted.

NOTE.—Totals in col. 1 are based on allocation of variable grants based on 1950 census. They are reallocated decennially on the basis of the census. For nearest available approximation to 1960 census (based on 1958 estimates), figures in col. 6 should be substituted for those in col. 5, and grand totals corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Dr. Elting present?
Do you desire to make a statement, Dr. Elting?

Dr. ELTING. Mr. Chairman, you earlier today received a report from the Department of Agriculture transmitted by our Assistant Secretary, Mr. Peterson.

We have no further prepared statement unless there are questions. Other than that I have no further testimony to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

The committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee adjourned.)

×

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86-658

S. 3450

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 3450.....	1
Digest of Public Law 86-658.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 3450

- March 3, 1960 Rep. Cooley introduced H. R. 10876, which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- March 8, 1960 Rep. Dixon introduced H. R. 10974, which was referred to the House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- Apr. 29, 1960 Sen. Ellender introduced (by request) S. 3450, which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- June 1, 1960 House committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10876.
- June 14, 1960 House committee reported H. R. 10876 without amendment. H. Rept. 1354. Print of bill and report.
- June 15, 1960 Senate committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3450.
- June 16, 1960 Senate committee reported S. 3450 without amendment. S. Rept. 1596. Print of bill and report.
- June 18, 1960 Senate passed over S. 3450 at the request of Senator Hart.
- June 23, 1960 S. 3450 was made the unfinished business of the Senate.
- June 24, 1960 Senate passed S. 3450 without amendment (in lieu of H. R. 10876).
- June 29, 1960 Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 10876. H. Res. 586, H. Rept. 2036. Print of resolution and report.
- July 2, 1960 House passed S. 3450 without amendment (in lieu of H. R. 10876). H. R. 10876 laid on table due to passage of S. 3450.
- July 14, 1960 Approved: Public Law 86-658
- Hearings on H. R. 10876 and H. R. 10974 before House Agriculture Committee, held on May 16 and 24, 1960.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-658

INCREASED FUNDS FOR RESIDENT TEACHING AT LAND-GRANT COLLEGES.

Authorizes increased appropriations in the form of grant funds for resident teaching at land-grant institutions. Authorizes an increase in the amount to be equally distributed to States from \$1 million each fiscal year to \$7,650,000, and an increase in the amount to be distributed annually on the basis of relative population from \$1,501,500 each fiscal year to \$4,300,000. Authorizes the University of Puerto Rico to participate in the benefits of the program on the same basis as the States.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10876

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 3, 1960

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended
4 (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete
6 endowment and support of the colleges in the several States
7 and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled
8 ‘An Act donating public lands to the several States and

1 Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of
2 agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862,
3 as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there
4 are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of
5 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the
6 following amounts:

7 “(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
8 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
9 \$7,650,000; and

10 “(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
11 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
12 \$4,300,000.

13 “The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a)
14 shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico
15 in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of
16 paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in
17 pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid
18 annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the
19 proportion to which the total population of each State and
20 Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States
21 and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decen-
22 nial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this
23 section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or
24 authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and
25 supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of

1 the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supple-
2 mented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and
3 payment of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a
4 portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more com-
5 plete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit
6 of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the
7 provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,'
8 approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented,
9 shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated
10 in pursuance of this section."

RECEIVED
JAN 2 1891
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

By Mr. COOLEY

MARCH 3, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

OFFICE OF THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

H. R. 10974

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 1918

Mr. [Name] introduced the following bill, which was read twice and passed on the [Date] of [Month] and [Year].

A BILL

For the purpose of [purpose of the bill], and for other purposes, the following bill was introduced, which was read twice and passed on the [Date] of [Month] and [Year].

1. [Text of the bill]

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10974

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 8, 1960

Mr. DIXON introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended
4 June 12, 1952 (Public Law 390, Eighty-second Congress),
5 be further amended as to section 22, to read as follows:

6 “SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete en-
7 dowment and support of the colleges in the several States
8 and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled
9 ‘An Act donating public lands to the several States and

1 Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agri-
2 culture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as
3 amended and supplemented (U.S.C., title 7, secs. 301-328;
4 Supp. VII, sec. 304), there are hereby authorized to be
5 appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury
6 not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

7 “(a) For the fiscal year beginning after the date of en-
8 actment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
9 \$7,650,000; and

10 “(b) For the first fiscal year following the date of enact-
11 ment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
12 \$4,300,000.

13 “The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a)
14 shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico
15 in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of
16 paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in
17 pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid
18 annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in
19 the proportion to which the total population of each State
20 and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States
21 and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decen-
22 nial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section
23 shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under
24 such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented,
25 and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges de-

1 fined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The pro-
2 visions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums
3 under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of the
4 proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endow-
5 ment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agricul-
6 ture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions
7 of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved
8 August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply
9 to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of
10 this section."

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

By Mr. DIXON

MARCH 8, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

SENATE
OFFICE

S. 3450

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 10, 1906

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE
MISMANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS

A BILL

TO AMEND THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879, RELATIVE TO THE
MISMANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS, AND TO
REPEAL THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879, RELATIVE TO THE
MISMANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC LANDS.

1. IN SENATE, APRIL 10, 1906.

1. The first part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

2. The second part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

3. The third part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

4. The fourth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

5. The fifth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

6. The sixth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

7. The seventh part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

8. The eighth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

9. The ninth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

10. The tenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

11. The eleventh part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

12. The twelfth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

13. The thirteenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

14. The fourteenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

15. The fifteenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

16. The sixteenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

17. The seventeenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

18. The eighteenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

19. The nineteenth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

20. The twentieth part of the paper is a review of the literature on the topic of the effect of the environment on the development of the human brain.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3450

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 29, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended
4 (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

5 "SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete
6 endowment and support of the colleges in the several States
7 and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled
8 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and
9 Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of

1 agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862,
2 as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there
3 are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of
4 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the
5 following amounts:

6 “(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
7 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
8 \$7,650,000; and

9 “(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
10 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
11 \$4,300,000.

12 “The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a)
13 shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico
14 in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of
15 paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in
16 pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid
17 annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the
18 proportion to which the total population of each State and
19 Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States
20 and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decen-
21 nial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section
22 shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized
23 under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supple-
24 mented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the
25 colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented.

1 The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of
2 sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of
3 the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endow-
4 ment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agricul-
5 ture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions
6 of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved
7 August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply
8 to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance
9 of this section."

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

By Mr. ELLENDER

APRIL 29, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

June 1, 1960

to develop new methods of controlling insects and other pests of plants and animals so as to avoid pesticide and other chemical residues, and to develop biological methods of pest control which will not create residue hazards.
p. 10784

14. COTTON. The Agriculture Committee reported with ^{out} amendment H. R. 12115, to extend the minimum national marketing quota for extra long staple cotton to the 1961 crop (H. Rept. 1729), and with amendment H. R. 11646, to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton by defining certain offenses in connection with the sampling of cotton for classification and providing a penalty provision (H. Rept. 1737). p. 10785
15. FRUITS AND NUTS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 12341, relating to the extension of the existing restrictions on imported commodities to lemons, oranges, figs, dates, and walnuts (H. Rept. 1734). p. 10785
16. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10569, and agreed to insist on its disagreement to a Senate amendment to limit the use of the Congressional frank. pp. 10742-4
17. RECLAMATION. Passed as reported S. 1892, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Norman reclamation project, Okla. (pp. 10753-70). Earlier a Rules Committee resolution for the consideration of this bill had been agreed to (pp. 10753-7).
18. INFORMATION. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. Con. Res. 75, favoring the active participation by Federal agencies in the Fifth International Congress on High-Speed Photography to be held in Washington, D. C. in 1960 (H. Rept. 1733). p. 10785
19. ~~SUGAR; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; LAND GRANT COLLEGES.~~ The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: p. D486
~~H. R. 12311, with amendment, to extend the Sugar Act of 1948;~~
~~H. R. 12420 (a clean bill introduced in lieu of H. R. 11049), to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage allotments;~~
H. R. 10876, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.
20. SMALL BUSINESS; DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: p. D486
H. R. 11207, to amend the Small Business Act so as to authorize an additional \$150,000,000 for loans to small business, and to make other technical amendments in the act;
H. R. 12052, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 additional years.
21. WATER RESOURCES. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 9999, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. p. D488
22. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman inserted and commented on a letter dealing with interest rates, and one dealing with payment of the national debt. pp. 10772-4

23. DEPRESSED AREAS. Rep. Widnall inserted a comparison between two depressed areas bills pending in Congress "that are supported by the administration," and the recently vetoed depressed areas bill. pp. 10781-2
24. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Thur., June 2, the House will consider H. R. 10572, the multiple uses forestry management bill, and H. R. 11761, relating to the consolidation of Farmers Home Administration loan authority. p. D486

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. McDowell stating that "the family farmer and the farsighted labor leader both have an enormous, but often unrecognized, stake in the well-being of the small businessman," and inserting a letter to the editor of Harper's magazine discussing their article, "How Small Business Cuts Its Throat." pp. A4623-4
26. AMERICAN SAMOA. Extension of remarks of Sen. Long, Hawaii, inserting the constitution of American Samoa and stating that "it provides a legal basis for a changing society ..." pp. A4624-8
27. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Porter inserted an address by S. L. Descartes, P. R., Water Resources Authority, "Electric Power: Key to Progress for the Underdeveloped Countries." pp. A4671-3

BILLS INTRODUCED

28. SUGAR. H. R. 12461, by Rep. Hoeven, to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, for 1 year and to authorize Presidential action during the time Congress is not in session if such action is in the national interest or is necessary to insure an adequate supply of sugar; to Agriculture Committee.
29. SALINE WATER. H. R. 12462, by Rep. Holifield, to expand and extend the saline water conversion program under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for accelerated research, development, demonstration, and application of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
30. WILDLIFE. H. R. 12463, by Rep. King, Utah, to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.
31. PERSONNEL. H. R. 12466, by Rep. Cohelan, to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wages rates; to Education and Labor Committee.
32. COMPACT. H. R. 12467, by Rep. McCormack, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to Public Works Committee.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

Issued June 15, 1960

For actions of June 14, 1960

86th-2d, No. 108

CONTENTS

Agricultural

appropriations.....	1
Animal research.....	36
Appropriations.....	1,14,31
Color additives.....	3
Conservation.....	29
Contracts.....	18,26
Defense production.....	15
Depressed areas.....	26
Education.....	5
Farm credit.....	38
Farm loans.....	13
FAS.....	22
Foreign affairs.....	27
Foreign aid.....	11
Foreign trade.....	12,24
Forestry.....	40,41
Hazardous substances.....	3
Housing.....	13
Humane slaughter.....	30
Information.....	19,23
Labor standards.....	33
Land-grant institutions..	5

Lands.....	8,17,40
Legislative program.....	31
Mutual security.....	11
Natural resources.....	29
Personnel.....	2,10,16,20,34,42
Postal service.....	39
Public debt.....	6
Public Law 480.....	22
Public works.....	31
Publications.....	19

Recreation.....	4
Research.....	23,32,36
River basin.....	35
Scientific information..	23
Sugar.....	25,37
Surplus property.....	21
Unemployment.....	26
Vehicles.....	2,20,34,42
Water.....	9
Wheat.....	28
Wildlife.....	7

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on agricultural appropriation bill. Senate committees reported: Housing bill; Labor-HEW appropriation bill; bill to extend Defense Production Act. House Rules Committee cleared bill for use of color additives in food. Sen. Aiken praised Foreign Agricultural Service. Rep. Hoeven introduced and discussed sugar bill.

HOUSE

1. **AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961.** Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 12117 (H. Rept. 1863) (pp. 11693-700, 11701). Attached to this digest is a copy of the conference report and a summary of the action of the conferees.
2. **PERSONNEL.** The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12620, to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment (H. Rept. 1863) (p. 11701). The "Daily Digest" states that this bill is a clean bill reported by the committee to overcome the objections contained in the President's veto of H. R. 7577. p. D550
3. **COLOR ADDITIVES; HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES.** The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment S. 1283, to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use (H. Rept. 1861). p. 11701

June 14, 1960

The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7624, to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics in accordance with regulations prescribing the conditions (including maximum tolerances) under which such additives may be safely used. p. 11701

4. RECREATION. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment H. R. 900, to provide that 75% of all moneys derived by the U. S. from certain recreation activities in connection with lands acquired for flood control and other purposes shall be paid to the State (H. Rept. 1821). p. 11700

The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12539, to authorize the Secretary of the Army, with the consent of Congress, to acquire lands and to establish facilities necessary for recreational purposes in connection with reservoir projects constructed with Federal funds (H. Rept. 1862). p. 11701

5. EDUCATION. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10876, to increase the appropriation authorization for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions (H. Rept. 1854). p. 11700

6. PUBLIC DEBT. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12346, to extend for two years the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase U. S. obligations directly from the Treasury (H. Rept. 1825). p. 11700

7. WILDLIFE. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10598, to clarify certain provisions of the Criminal Code relating to the importation or shipment of injurious mammals, birds, amphibians, fish, and reptiles, and relating to the transportation or receipt of wild mammals or birds taken in violation of State, National or foreign laws (H. Rept. 1823). pp. 11700-1

8. LANDS. Received from the Defense Department proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of lands in the Ladd-Eielson, Big Delta, and Granite Creek areas of Alaska; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 11700

9. WATER DEVELOPMENT. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12564, to authorize multiple-purpose development at Victory Reservoir site, Vt. (H. Rept. 1830). p. 11700

10. PERSONNEL. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 12336, to amend the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the preservation of basic compensation in downgrading actions. p. D550

11. MUTUAL SECURITY. Rep. Yates criticized the Appropriations Committee's action against the use of funds to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act relating to the U. S. contribution toward settlement of the Indus River Basin controversy between India and Pakistan. p. 11688

Rep. Conte agreed with Rep. Yates' criticism and stated that he would offer an amendment to "delete this limitation." pp. 11694-6

12. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Bray urged support for a resolution which would express the sense of Congress that no further tariff reductions be granted by the U. S. in forthcoming tariff negotiations. p. 11689

SUPPORT FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

JUNE 14, 1960.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 10876]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10876) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agricultural and mechanical arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is very simple: To restore the level of support by the Federal Government of teaching in the national system of land-grant colleges and universities to the level authorized by Congress in 1935. These colleges and universities were founded by Federal action and have for nearly a century carried on national functions while under the control and direction of duly established State authorities. The land-grant institutions have received direct Federal appropriations for teaching purposes since the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890. These funds have not been increased since 1935, although there is general agreement among all college and university officials that funds for faculty salaries are the most critical need of our colleges and universities at the present time. What this bill proposes is an increase in these teaching funds simply to bring them up to the same standard, in terms of the formula on which they were appropriated in 1935, as they were 25 years ago. This would still leave the proportion of Federal funds compared to the amount appropriated by the States, far less than it was 25 years ago.

The additional funds authorized by this bill to be appropriated could be used only for teaching purposes and only in the subjects authorized by the original land-grant college act.

HISTORY OF THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The national system of land-grant colleges and universities was established by the passage of the first Morrill Act in 1862. Under this act each State was offered grants of Federal land proportionate to its membership in Congress, the land to be sold and the proceeds invested as a permanent endowment fund with the income going for the support of teaching in at least one college in each State. The use of this money for the construction, maintenance or repair of buildings was prohibited. This college was to emphasize "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto" and to include military tactics in its course offerings. The act provided that "other scientific and classical subjects should not be excluded" and said that the great objective was the "liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

It was apparently the intention of the Congress at the time of the passage of the first Morrill Act that the income from the national endowment would fully support instruction in these colleges. The States were required to furnish the buildings and equipment, or see that they were furnished. Control over the methods of instruction, etc., was reserved entirely to the States.

As time passed it became clear that the income from the land endowment would not support the instructional program of the colleges if they were to meet the needs of the young people of their States and of the Nation. Thus State support for instruction, as well as for buildings and equipment, became an increasingly important factor.

In 1890 the Congress recognized that Federal instructional support from the land-endowment investment was far short of what had been contemplated, and passed the second Morrill Act, providing direct annual grants to the colleges for instruction in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto." This act was passed unanimously in both Houses of Congress. In 1907 it was amended and increased, and constitutes a permanent appropriation act in the amount of \$2,550,000, representing \$50,000 to each State and Puerto Rico for use in supporting instruction in the land-grant institutions of those States.

In 1935, the Congress included in the Bankhead-Jones Act, as authored by this committee, a provision which granted an additional \$20,000 to each State for teaching purposes in its land-grant institutions, and an additional amount which is distributed to each State on the basis of population. The total of funds authorized under this title of the Bankhead-Jones Act is now \$2,501,500, of which \$1 million is distributed on the basis of \$20,000 to each of the 50 States; and the remainder on a population basis. Puerto Rico is not included in this act, but would be included as the act is amended by this bill.

BASIS OF INCREASED AUTHORIZATION

Since 1935 the population of the United States, upon which part of the apportionment of land-grant funds is based, has increased 40 percent. Also, since 1935 we have had an inflation of 100 percent. The present total of annual appropriations to land-grant institutions for teaching purposes from the Morrill Act of 1890, as amended, and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 is \$5,051,500. The bill would

increase that amount by applying the 40-percent population increase factor and the 100-percent inflationary factor to this 1935 level of appropriation. In addition, authorization would be added to permit Puerto Rico to participate on an equal basis with institutions in other States. The second Morrill Act of 1890 is in the nature of a permanent appropriation. Therefore, this bill amends only the Bankhead-Jones Act merely increasing the authorization for this purpose, leaving the actual appropriation to be made in the usual manner through annual appropriation acts.

The committee believes that this is a modest proposal. Had it used as a basis for the increase the increase in enrollment in land-grant institutions since 1935, which was suggested to the committee as being equitable, the increase in authorized appropriations would have been several times as large. Enrollments in the land-grant institutions were about 190,000 in 1935. Of these only 15,000 were in the advanced and highly expensive and important category of graduate students. Currently the enrollments are approximately 650,000, of which 75,000 are graduate students. Thus, there is an increase of 340 percent in total enrollment and an increase of 500 percent in graduate enrollment in these land-grant institutions. Thus, on the basis of the job the land-grant institutions are doing today, as compared to 1935, an increase in Federal participation of at least \$30 million would have been justified.

USE OF FUNDS

Land-grant teaching funds are available for support of instruction in a wide range of basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. The limitation placed on their use by the statutes is that they be expended for teaching and that this teaching be in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto." The interpretation of this language has been broad, as Congress clearly intended it to be, and has permitted support of instruction in the land-grant colleges in accordance with the changing scientific and technical needs of our society. Thus instruction is supported in the basic fields of physical science such as chemistry, physics, and metallurgy, as well as in all the fields of engineering which are based on the application of these subjects. The funds may be used in botany, zoology, bacteriology, and entomology—the sciences basic to agriculture, as well as in the applied fields of agriculture itself. They may be used for mathematics, essential in all scientific fields, and for basic instruction in English. They may also be used for support of the important and growing field of veterinary medicine, so basic both to human and animal health.

The following table shows the uses to which these funds were put in the fiscal year 1959.

Expenditures of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds, by field, year ended June 30, 1959 (from Federal funds appropriated for instruction at land-grant colleges and universities)

State	Expenditures					Expenditures by subject-matter field				
	Total	Salaries	Facilities	Agriculture	Mechanic arts	English language	Mathematical science	Natural and physical science	Economic science	Special preparation of teachers
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Total.....	\$5,051,622.73	\$4,919,805.82	\$131,816.91	\$792,445.73	\$1,415,823.04	\$656,806.11	\$446,076.24	\$1,342,139.65	\$370,883.59	\$27,448.37
Alabama 1	100,541.43	94,349.43	6,192.00	2 14,577.00	2 30,502.00	2 19,868.43	8,560.00	2 19,713.00	7,321.00	
Alaska.....	71,283.24	71,283.24		1,422.00	15,841.16	10,113.45	9,441.22	19,943.77	14,521.64	
Arizona.....	77,464.26	77,464.26				25,632.26		44,560.00	7,272.00	
Arkansas 1	89,047.71	88,415.65	632.06	2 9,388.48	2 15,646.97	9,733.00	4,199.98	39,695.98	10,383.30	
California.....	175,599.47	175,599.47		23,400.00	51,300.00			75,699.47	16,800.00	8,400.00
Colorado.....	83,218.00	83,218.00			16,634.63	26,383.97	16,783.15	23,406.25		
Connecticut.....	90,008.98	90,008.98		11,087.00	20,520.00	16,200.00	6,240.00	27,501.98	1,469.67	
Delaware 1	73,172.96	68,433.29	4,739.67	13,270.00	14,502.59	30,149.68	5,781.10	7,999.92	8,460.00	
Florida 1	98,065.51	98,065.51		25,000.13	18,328.88	12,101.00	35,452.50	7,183.00		
Georgia 1	104,360.28	104,360.28		51,200.28	8,750.00	6,800.00	8,000.00	17,500.00	8,860.00	3,250.00
Hawaii.....	75,460.99	75,460.99			5,856.00		13,168.70	20,367.52	36,068.77	
Idaho.....	75,871.76	75,871.76		30,903.76	17,176.00			18,942.00	8,850.00	
Illinois.....	156,905.51	156,905.51			30,328.00	45,913.51	17,492.00	63,172.00		
Indiana.....	109,244.59	109,244.59		7,104.00	54,000.00			48,140.59		
Iowa.....	96,145.67	96,145.67		27,831.00	23,286.67			10,923.00	9,847.00	
Kansas.....	89,005.70	89,005.70			25,731.70	17,121.00	9,992.00	20,227.00	15,934.00	
Kentucky 1	99,374.97	99,374.97		28,610.87	59,743.60	2,100.00	2,000.00	2,400.00	3,890.00	630.50
Louisiana 1	96,768.55	96,768.55		28,128.75	13,364.75	13,706.28	14,631.00	18,523.85	8,413.92	
Maine.....	79,115.06	79,115.06		4,956.70	26,449.03	8,451.52	6,332.58	23,316.36	9,608.87	
Maryland 1	93,371.85	93,371.85		9,499.00		23,000.00	12,000.00	40,872.85	8,000.00	
Massachusetts 1	116,788.72	116,788.72	166.00	1,782.82	2 29,078.00	12,872.00	13,984.67	40,441.23	18,630.00	
Michigan.....	133,559.50	133,559.50		14,700.00	38,940.00			76,819.50	3,100.00	
Minnesota.....	99,750.80	99,750.80		13,277.00	31,311.00	11,409.00	12,337.00	12,905.00	14,540.80	3,971.00
Mississippi 1	91,735.06	91,735.06		6,009.00	20,047.00	17,209.80	10,144.21	22,329.23	14,245.82	1,750.00
Missouri 1	109,446.30	103,365.96	6,080.34	2 9,289.25	2 65,123.47	9,274.90	2 2,723.14	2 19,467.41	2 3,207.26	2 360.87
Montana.....	75,895.57	75,895.57		13,874.94	22,029.13	8,075.00	5,833.30	15,666.60	10,416.60	
Nebraska.....	83,222.20	83,222.20			83,222.20					
Nevada.....	71,506.86	71,506.86		6,770.12	23,015.00	4,511.68	28,156.31	9,143.75		
New Hampshire.....	75,319.18	75,319.18			21,500.00	36,500.00		7,700.00	9,619.18	
New Jersey.....	118,233.27	118,233.27		34,000.00	20,000.00	18,000.00	8,000.00	33,233.27	5,000.00	
New Mexico.....	76,794.96	76,728.00	66.96	2 24,284.96	20,244.00	6,108.00	4,608.00	15,850.00	5,700.00	
New York.....	217,188.69	210,305.03	6,883.66	2 86,428.40	97,760.29	25,000.00		8,000.00		
North Carolina 1	110,518.47	110,518.47		32,500.00	50,000.37	7,047.00	10,000.00	7,471.10	1,590.00	2,090.00
North Dakota.....	76,180.98	76,180.98			60,931.43			7,945.83	7,300.72	
Ohio.....	149,269.02	149,269.02		15,070.02	62,503.00	41,932.24	20,856.00	8,847.76		
Oklahoma 1	92,278.07	92,278.07		29,528.80	13,000.00	3,000.00	12,943.00	24,496.27	9,400.00	

Oregon.....	85,175.65	28,000.00	16,600.00	3,175.65	5,200.00	22,300.00	9,900.00
Pennsylvania.....	174,719.55	11,004.00	62,004.00	23,356.00	9,392.00	68,963.55	
Puerto Rico.....	50,000.21	50,000.21					
Rhode Island.....	77,899.30	12,721.30	19,417.00	9,132.00	13,125.00	16,332.00	7,172.00
South Carolina ¹	91,117.72		35,253.72	15,148.00	13,214.00	9,752.00	6,250.00
South Dakota.....	76,511.20		27,166.64	11,978.00	11,888.88	25,477.68	
Tennessee ¹	102,835.48		² 13,564.71	² 8,500.00	² 15,000.00	² 40,890.00	5,500.00
Texas ¹	146,920.54	² 17,384.77	² 34,005.00		² 117.00	² 75,150.54	² 7,586.00
Utah.....	76,871.52	² 35,756.00	7,700.04	18,616.44	12,030.04	14,499.96	15,875.04
Vermont.....	73,768.09	8,130.00	18,000.00		14,726.85	16,000.00	15,504.00
Virginia ¹	103,104.43		29,119.10	12,731.15	12,949.11	23,776.61	11,881.38
Washington.....	93,730.58	12,647.05		40,351.63		53,378.95	
West Virginia.....	90,005.74			² 10,304.52	15,666.50	² 64,034.72	
Wisconsin.....	104,260.50				8,500.00	17,506.04	² 4,564.62
Wyoming.....	72,898.08	² 27,366.88	46,322.96	16,644.00	8,914.00	33,852.04	13,488.00

¹ Includes expenditures for the 2 land-grant institutions in this State.² Includes expenditures for facilities.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, Apr. 26, 1960.

IMPORTANCE OF THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities constitute fewer than 5 percent of all the institutions of higher education of all kinds in the United States, and they enroll more than 21 percent of all the students in 4-year colleges and universities. But their significance is out of all proportion to their enrollment. They train 100 percent of all those who receive doctor's degrees in agriculture and more than 80 percent of all those getting bachelor's degrees.

In the basic biological sciences, they grant 56 percent of all doctor's degrees—the level of training required for research, and over 50 percent at the master's degree level, required for secondary teaching in this important field. Ninety-five percent of all entomologists in this country, the men and women who deal with our insect pests, get their first degrees at land-grant institutions, as do 55 percent of all people who start out in bacteriology and its related fields so essential in both agriculture and in the health sciences. About 37 percent of all students who later go into medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry get their first degrees at land-grant institutions. At the doctor's degree level of professional training these institutions graduate 93 percent of all so trained in the United States.

Thirty percent of all those who get master's degrees in mathematics in the United States—the level required for secondary school teaching—get these degrees at land-grant institutions; while at the doctoral level required for high level research and college teaching the figure is more than 39 percent. In the related field of statistics, the land-grant institutions grant 48 percent of all first degrees and nearly 60 percent of all doctoral degrees.

In engineering, 41 percent of all engineers receiving their first degrees in the United States come from land-grant institutions; while at the doctor's degree level the figure is nearly 53 percent. And 72 percent of all the forestry students in the country get their degrees in the land-grant group.

In the basic physical sciences: The land-grant institutions give 42 percent of all doctoral degrees in all fields, including 36 percent of all physicists, 40 percent of all chemists, and 73 percent of all geologists.

MILITARY TRAINING

There is another teaching area in which the land-grant college system is of great importance—the field of military science and tactics. The act of July 2, 1862, requires that institutions established thereunder must include training in military tactics. Although there was no formal way in which this training could lead to formal status in the Armed Forces prior to the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920 which founded the ROTC program, the records show that at least 100,000 men who had military training on land-grant institutions served in World War I, and that 30,000 of them became officers. Between World War I and World War II, the land-grant institutions furnished annually from 50 to 70 percent of all young men receiving commissions via the Reserve Officers Training Corps program. General Marshall is authority for the statement that mobilization in World War II would have been delayed at least 6 months without the availability of these men. President Eisenhower, while Chief of Staff of the Army, made a similar observation.

Since World War II there has been a vast expansion of the number of colleges and universities offering military training: but the land-grant institutions, at a conservative estimate, still furnish substantially more than a third of all Regular and Reserve officers not supplied by the military academies.

HEARINGS

Hearings were held on two identical bills (H.R. 10876 by Mr. Cooley, reported herewith, and H.R. 10974 by Mr. Dixon). At the hearings spokesmen for the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and general farm organizations appeared in favor of the bill. In addition, statements or communications in favor of the legislation were received from several Members of Congress and from the presidents of approximately 35 State universities. There were no witnesses in opposition to the bill.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Agriculture made no recommendation as to the enactment of the bill, pointing out in its letter that it relates to a provision of law administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In its letter, however, the Department of Agriculture stated that "strengthening the resident teaching program at the land-grant institutions would be of direct benefit to this Department" and that "because of the growing complexity and increased dependence on science and technology and all phases of agriculture, there will be an increased demand for technically trained personnel."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, took a position in opposition to the bill, apparently because the bill does not make funds available to all institutions of higher education. At the same time this Department states in its report that "any Federal aid to higher education should be pinpointed toward higher priority needs." It is the opinion of this committee that the bill reported herewith does exactly that.

Following are the texts of the reports from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of March 4, for a report on H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

This Department makes no recommendation as to the enactment of this bill since it relates to a provision of law administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The primary purpose of this bill is to authorize increased appropriations in the form of grant funds for resident teaching at land grant institutions. It would also authorize the University of Puerto Rico to participate in the benefits of the program on the same basis as the

States. The basic legislation would not be modified in other respects. Specific conditions contained in the bill are as follows: (1) Increases the amount to be equally distributed to States from \$1 million each fiscal year to \$7,650,000; and (2) Increases the amount to be distributed annually on the basis of relative population from \$1,501,500 each fiscal year to \$4,300,000.

While we have no information as to the need for larger Federal grants, strengthening the resident teaching program at the land grant institutions would be of direct benefit to this Department by improving the quality of instruction and probably by increasing the number of students who would be trained in agricultural subjects. This, of course, is very important because of the high percentage of employees recruited by this Department from these institutions. The need for more persons trained in agriculture is increasing. Commercial organizations in recent years have expanded their recruitment programs in the land grant institutions and this had made it increasingly difficult to attract agriculturally trained students for positions in this Department.

Continuing scientific progress in all areas affecting agriculture will require a progressive increase in the number of technically trained people with farm and agricultural college background. Shortages in the biological sciences are just as great as they are in physics, engineering, and other technical fields. Because of the growing complexity and increased dependence on science and technology in all phases of agriculture, there will be an increasing demand for technically trained personnel beyond that required in Federal, State, and industrial research. The increasing amount of basic research in the Department of Agriculture and at the agricultural experiment station also calls for more specialized training on the graduate level.

It is our understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will comment on H.R. 10876 from the standpoint of the general relationship of the Federal Government to institutions of higher learning.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of March 23, 1960, for a report on H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

This bill would amend section 22 (7 U.S.C. 329) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, to increase the authorization for annual appropriations for Federal grants to the States for the support of resident teaching in land-grant colleges and universities, and to include Puerto Rico in the provisions of the act. The existing

authorization of \$1 million, allotted equally among the States, would be increased to \$7,650,000; the authorization of \$1,501,500, allotted on the basis of relative State population, would be increased to \$4,300,000. Thus the total increase in authorized annual appropriations for these purposes would be \$9,448,500.

Annual appropriations for a grant of \$50,000 to each State to be applied to instruction in land-grant institutions are also authorized by the second (1890) Morrill Act, as amended. Puerto Rico is eligible to receive these grants. The funds made available under the Bankhead-Jones and the second Morrill Acts may be used only for "instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and in the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic science, * * * and to facilities for such instruction." The appropriations authorized under both acts for these purposes total \$5,051,500. The proposed increase in the section 22 authorization would increase the total authorization of appropriations for this purpose by approximately 140 percent.

We are, of course, fully aware of the immeasurable contribution which our land-grant institutions have made and are making to the cause of higher education in this country. However, we do not believe that additional Federal appropriations limited to this particular group of institutions can be justified in the light of present day needs in higher education and in the light of the contribution that many other institutions of higher education, public and private, can make in meeting these needs. Any Federal aid to higher education should be pinpointed toward high priority needs and should be made available to any qualified institution of higher education able and willing to do its part in meeting these needs. This basic principle underlies the National Defense Education Act and all legislative proposals which this Administration has made or endorsed in aid of higher education, including its pending proposal for Federal assistance in the construction of housing and academic facilities (H.R. 4267 and H.R. 4415).

For these reasons we are unable to recommend enactment of H.R. 10876.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

ACT OF JUNE 29, 1935, AS AMENDED (7 U.S.C. 329)

* * * * *

§ 329. Additional appropriation for agricultural colleges.

[In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii entitled to the benefits of sections 301-305, 307 and 308 of this

title, there are authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

[(a) For the fiscal year beginning after June 29, 1935, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$1,000,000; and

[(b) For the fiscal year following the first fiscal year for which an appropriation is made in pursuance of paragraph (a) of this section \$500,000, and for each of the two fiscal years thereafter \$500,000 more than the amount authorized to be appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, and for each fiscal year thereafter \$1,501,500. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) of this section shall be paid annually to the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of this paragraph shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) of this section and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in the proportion which the total population of each such State and Territory bears to the total population of all the States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under sections 301-305, 307 and 308 of this title, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such sections. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under sections 321-326 and 328 of this title, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section. (June 29, 1935, ch. 338, § 22, 49 Stat. 439; June 12, 1952, ch. 419, §§ 1-4, 66 Stat. 135.)]

SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled "An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more

complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862," approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section.



Union Calendar No. 816

86TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10876

[Report No. 1854]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 3, 1960

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 14, 1960

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended
4 (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete
6 endowment and support of the colleges in the several States
7 and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled
8 ‘An Act donating public lands to the several States and
9 Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of

1 agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862,
2 as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there
3 are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of
4 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the
5 following amounts:

6 “(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
7 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
8 \$7,650,000; and

9 “(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
10 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
11 \$4,300,000.

12 “The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a)
13 shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico
14 in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of
15 paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in
16 pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid
17 annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the
18 proportion to which the total population of each State and
19 Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States
20 and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decen-
21 nial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this
22 section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or
23 authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and
24 supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of
25 the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supple-

1 mented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and
2 payments of sums under the Act entitled ‘An Act to apply a
3 portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more com-
4 plete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit
5 of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the
6 provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,’
7 approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented,
8 shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated
9 in pursuance of this section.”

86TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10876

[Report No. 1854]

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

By Mr. COOLEY

MARCH 3, 1960

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JUNE 14, 1960

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

June 15, 1961

8. LANDS; ELECTRIFICATION. The Government Operations Committee approved two reports, "Land Appraisal Practices, Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona" and "Electric Power Contract for Yellowstone National Park." p. D557

9. APPROPRIATIONS; ITEM VETO. Rep. Schwengel spoke in support of legislation to give the President authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills, and reviewed the history of the item veto as it has been used in the various States. pp. 11831-3

SENATE

10. MILK; PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2917, to modify the price support level for milk and butterfat (S. Rept. 1592). p. 11705

11. COTTON; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; LAND GRANT COLLEGES. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: p. D554

~~H. R. 12115, to extend the present minimum national marketing quota for extra-long staple cotton to the 1961 crop;~~

~~H. R. 11646, with amendment, to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton by defining certain offenses in connection with the sampling of cotton classification and providing a penalty provision;~~

~~S. 3117, to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage allotments; and~~

S. 3450, relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, to increase the authorized appropriations for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

12. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3485, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation costs for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the U. S. (S. Rept. 1584). pp. 11705

The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 766, to amend existing laws so as to modify the strict penalty provision in title 5, U. S. Code, for the use of Government-owned vehicles and aircraft for other than official purposes and give to the heads of departments or agencies the discretion of fixing the disciplinary action in any given case (S. Rept. 1587). p. 11705

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported an original bill, S. 3672, to increase the salaries of Federal classified and postal employees (S. Rept. 1590). p. 11705

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7758, to improve the administration of overseas activities of the Government by providing for the establishment of a coordinated and uniform system for more effectively compensating Government employees for additional costs, and for hardships and inconveniences, incident to their working assignments in overseas areas and providing for uniformity of treatment for all overseas employees to the extent justified by relative conditions of employment; and S. 3421, relating to payment of death benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act. p. D555

13. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. J. Res. 95, providing for the acceleration of the reforestation programs of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. p. D554

Sen. Goldwater commended the Forest Service on their work in creating "a very unique playground out of land that was of little value to either the citizenry or the Forest Service" and suggested that similar programs throughout the U. S. would be of value. pp. 11712-3

14. WATERSHEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following watershed projects: Caney Creek, Ky.; Chippewa Creek, Ohio; Ischua Creek, N. Y.; Mill Creek, Pa.; North Broad River, Ga.; North Fork of Little River, Ky.; and West Fork, Clarks River, Ky. p. D554
15. WILDLIFE; CHEMICAL PESTICIDES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 3473, requiring consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and appropriate State agencies prior to instituting programs using chemical pesticides in biological control. The "Daily Digest" states that this bill was amended by the substitution of the language of H. R. 12419, a similar bill which has been reported by the House. p. D555
16. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 11998, but deferred final consideration until today, June 16. pp. 11784-5
17. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee this bill, H. R. 11389. p. D554
18. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee this bill, H. R. 11776. p. D554
19. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 3228, relating to issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity by the ICC to certain common carriers by motor vehicle. p. D555
The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 3278, to amend the Housing Act of 1954 to assist State and local governments and their instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas (S. Rept. 1591). p. 11705
20. BOTANICAL GARDEN. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment S. 2919, to authorize the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to study and investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing a national tropical botanic garden in Hawaii (S. Rept. 1589). p. 11705
21. INFORMATION; PUBLICATIONS. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3579, to authorize agencies of the Government of the U. S. to pay in advance for required publications (S. Rept. 1583). p. 11705
Received a report by the Comptroller General "Refusals to the General Accounting Office of Access to Records of the Executive Departments and Agencies" (S. Doc. 108). p. 11707
22. CONTRACTS; PURCHASING. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment S. 3487, to amend the "Anti-Kickback Statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts (S. Rept. 1585). p. 11705
23. LANDS. Received from the Defense Department proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of lands in the Ladd-Eielson, Big Delta,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued June 17, 1960
For actions of June 16, 1960
86th-2d, No. 110

Acreage allotments.....6		
Appropriations.....2,8,14		
Casein imports.....23		
Cooperatives.....26		
Cotton.....3		
Development Loan Fund...14		
Economics.....27		
Education.....4		
Farm labor.....30		
Farm loans.....1,22		
Farm program.....26		
Flood control.....14		
Foreign affairs.....27		
Foreign aid.....14		
Forestry.....5,19		
Housing.....1,9,20		
Interest rates.....26		
Lands.....5,11,25		
Legislative program.....13		
Marketing quotas.....6		
Metropolitan affairs.....9		
Milk.....17		
Minerals.....25		
Minimum wage.....15		
Mutual security.....14		
Ocean freight.....14		
Pay raise.....13		
Personnel...10,13,19,24,28		
Pesticides.....7		
Property.....19		
Public Law 480.....15,17		
Purchasing.....31		
Reclamation.....12		
Ryukyu Islands.....14		
Small business.....29,31		
Sugar.....26		
Surplus commodities.....14		
Technical cooperation...14		
Water resources.....14		
Watersheds.....21		
Wildlife.....7		
Wool.....18		
Youth corps.....14		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed housing bill which includes continuation of farm-housing loans provision. Senate committee reported bills to continue extra long staple cotton quota and to provide for advance consultation with Interior regarding pesticide use. House committee voted to introduce clean bill on amendments to Public Law 480. House debated mutual security appropriation bill. Rep. Marshall criticized program for export of nonfat dry milk. House committee voted to report bill to increase minimum wage level.

SENATE

1. **HOUSING; FARM LOANS.** Passed, 64-16, with amendments S. 3670, the housing bill (pp. 11999, 12001-038). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Capehart (concurred in by Sen. Sparkman) which "would extend the farm housing loan section to June 30, 1963, but would eliminate the \$50 million in the bill, which I think we have discovered, since the bill was written, is not particularly needed for the next year" (p. 12013).
2. **DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961.** Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 11998. pp. 11928-38, 11943-88, 11990-1
3. **COTTON.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11646, to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, by defining certain offenses in connection with the sampling of cotton for classification and

providing a penalty provision (S. Rept. 1595). p. 11894

4. EDUCATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 3450, to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the appropriation authorization for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions (S. Rept. 1596). p. 11894
5. FOREST LANDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 3665, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway (S. Rept. 1597). p. 11894
- MARKETING QUOTAS.
6. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 3117, to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage (S. Rept. 1598).
The Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12115, to extend the minimum national marketing quota for extra long staple cotton to the 1961 crop (S. Rept. 1599). p. 11894
7. FISH AND WILDLIFE; PESTICIDES. The Interstate and Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 3473, to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls (S. Rept. 1601). p. 11894
8. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 12232 (S. Rept. 1606). p. 11894
9. HOUSING; METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 3292, to provide for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs (S. Rept. 1607). p. 11894
10. PERSONNEL. ^{Both Houses} received from the Commerce Department a proposed bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees. pp. 11893, 11891
11. PUBLIC LANDS Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration S. J. Res. 95, to accelerate reforestation programs; H. R. 9142, to pay for lands heretofore conveyed to the U. S. as a basis for lieu selections; H. R. 8740, to provide for leasing oil and gas interests in certain U. S. lands to Texas; S. 2806, to revise Coronado Memorial boundaries; S. 2959, to clarify State rights to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit; and S. 3434, to facilitate Alaska's selection of certain public lands. p. D561
12. RECLAMATION. Sen. Young, N. Dak., inserted a Reclamation Association statement criticizing some reclamation policies. pp. 11926-7
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. H. R. 9883, the Federal pay bill, was made the unfinished business (p. 12038).

SUPPORT FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

JUNE 16, 1960.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 3450]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3450) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

This bill is identical to H.R. 10876 which was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture on June 14, 1960. Hearings on this bill were held by the House committee on May 16 and 24, 1960.

The report of the House Committee on Agriculture explaining fully the purpose of the bill, the use of the funds, and the importance of land-grant colleges in the educational field is attached.

[H. Rept. 1854, 86th Cong., 2d sess.]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10876) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agricultural and mechanical arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is very simple. To restore the level of support by the Federal Government of teaching in the national system of land-grant colleges and universities to the level authorized by Congress in 1935. These colleges and universities were founded by

Federal action and have for nearly a century carried on national functions while under the control and direction of duly established State authorities. The land-grant institutions have received direct Federal appropriations for teaching purposes since the passage of the second Morrill Act in 1890. These funds have not been increased since 1935, although there is general agreement among all college and university officials that funds for faculty salaries are the most critical need of our colleges and universities at the present time. What this bill proposes is an increase in these teaching funds simply to bring them up to the same standard, in terms of the formula on which they were appropriated in 1935, as they were 25 years ago. This would still leave the proportion of Federal funds compared to the amount appropriated by the States, far less than it was 25 years ago.

The additional funds authorized by this bill to be appropriated could be used only for teaching purposes and only in the subjects authorized by the original land-grant college act.

HISTORY OF THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The national system of land-grant colleges and universities was established by the passage of the first Morrill Act in 1862. Under this act each State was offered grants of Federal land proportionate to its membership in Congress, the land to be sold and the proceeds invested as a permanent endowment fund with the income going for the support of teaching in at least one college in each State. The use of this money for the construction, maintenance or repair of buildings was prohibited. This college was to emphasize "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto" and to include military tactics in its course offerings. The act provided that "other scientific and classical subjects should not be excluded" and said that the great objective was the "liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

It was apparently the intention of the Congress at the time of the passage of the first Morrill Act that the income from the national endowment would fully support instruction in these colleges. The States were required to furnish the buildings and equipment, or see that they were furnished. Control over the methods of instruction, etc., was reserved entirely to the States.

As time passed it became clear that the income from the land endowment would not support the instructional program of the colleges if they were to meet the needs of the young people of their States and of the Nation. Thus State support for instruction, as well as for buildings and equipment, became an increasingly important factor.

In 1890 the Congress recognized that Federal instructional support from the land-endowment investment was far short of what had been contemplated, and passed the second Morrill Act, providing direct annual grants to the colleges for instruction in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto. This act was passed unanimously in both Houses of Congress. In 1907 it was amended and increased, and constitutes a permanent appropriation act in the amount of \$2,550,000, representing \$50,000 to each State and Puerto Rico for use in supporting instruction in the land-grant institutions of those States.

In 1935, the Congress included in the Bankhead-Jones Act, as authored by this committee, a provision which granted an additional \$20,000 to each State for teaching purposes in its land-grant institutions, and an additional amount which is distributed to each State on the basis of population. The total of funds authorized under this title of the Bankhead-Jones Act is now \$2,501,500, of which \$1 million is distributed on the basis of \$20,000 to each of the 50 States; and the remainder on a population basis. Puerto Rico is not included in this act, but would be included as the act is amended by this bill.

BASIS OF INCREASED AUTHORIZATION

Since 1935 the population of the United States, upon which part of the appointment of land-grant funds is based, has increased 40 percent. Also, since 1935 we have had an inflation of 100 percent. The present total of annual appropriations to land-grant institutions for teaching purposes from the Morrill Act of 1890, as amended, and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 is \$5,051,500. The bill would increase that amount by applying the 40-percent population increase factor and the 100-percent inflationary factor to this 1935 level of appropriation. In addition, authorization would be added to permit Puerto Rico to participate on an equal basis with institutions in other States. The second Morrill Act of 1890 is in the nature of a permanent appropriation. Therefore, this bill amends only the Bankhead-Jones Act merely increasing the authorization for this purpose, leaving the actual appropriation to be made in the usual manner through annual appropriation acts.

The committee believes that this is a modest proposal. Had it used as a basis for the increase the increase in enrollment in land-grant institutions since 1935, which was suggested to the committee as being equitable, the increase in authorized appropriations would have been several times as large. Enrollments in the land-grant institutions were about 190,000 in 1935. Of these only 15,000 were in the advanced and highly expensive and important category of graduate students. Currently the enrollments are approximately 650,000, of which 75,000 are graduate students. Thus, there is an increase of 340 percent in total enrollment and an increase of 500 percent in graduate enrollment in these land-grant institutions. Thus, on the basis of the job the land-grant institutions are doing today, as compared to 1935, an increase in Federal participation of at least \$30 million would have been justified.

USE OF FUNDS

Land-grant teaching funds are available for support of instruction in a wide range of basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. The limitation placed on their use by the statutes is that they be expended for teaching and that this teaching be in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto." The interpretation of this language has been broad, as Congress clearly intended it to be, and has permitted support of instruction in the land-grant colleges in accordance with the changing scientific and technical needs of our society. Thus instruction is supported in the basic fields of physical science such as chemistry, physics, and metal-

lurgy, as well as in all the fields of engineering which are based on the application of these subjects. The funds may be used in botany, zoology, bacteriology, and entomology—the sciences basic to agriculture, as well as in the applied fields of agriculture itself. They may be used for mathematics, essential in all scientific fields, and for basic instruction in English. They may also be used for support of the important and growing field of veterinary medicine, so basic both to human and animal health.

The following table shows the uses to which these funds were put in the fiscal year 1959.

SUPPORT FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

5

State	Expenditures			Expenditures by subject-matter field							Special preparation of teachers (11)
	Total (2)	Salaries (3)	Facilities (4)	Agriculture (5)	Mechanic arts (6)	English language (7)	Mathematical science (8)	Natural and physical science (9)	Economic science (10)		
(1)											
Total.....	\$5,051,622.73	\$4,919,805.82	\$131,816.91	\$792,445.73	\$1,415,823.04	\$656,806.11	\$446,076.24	\$1,342,139.65	\$370,883.59	\$27,448.37	
Alabama 1	100,541.43	94,349.43		2 14,577.00	2 30,502.00	2 19,868.43	8,560.00	2 19,713.00	7,321.00	-----	
Alaska.....	71,283.24	71,283.24	6,192.00	1,422.00	15,841.16	10,113.45	9,441.22	19,943.77	14,521.64	-----	
Arizona.....	77,464.26	77,464.26	-----	-----	-----	25,632.26	-----	44,560.00	7,272.00	-----	
Arkansas 1	89,047.71	88,145.65	632.06	2 9,388.48	2 15,646.97	9,733.00	4,199.08	39,695.98	10,883.30	-----	
California.....	175,599.47	175,599.47	-----	23,400.00	51,300.00	-----	-----	75,699.47	16,800.00	8,400.00	
Colorado.....	83,218.00	83,218.00	-----	-----	16,634.63	26,393.97	16,783.15	23,406.25	-----	-----	
Connecticut.....	90,008.98	90,008.98	-----	11,087.00	20,520.00	16,200.00	6,240.00	27,501.98	8,460.00	-----	
Delaware 1	73,172.96	68,433.29	4,739.67	13,270.00	14,502.59	30,149.68	5,781.00	7,999.92	1,469.67	-----	
Florida 1	98,065.51	98,065.51	-----	25,000.13	18,328.88	12,101.00	35,452.50	17,500.00	8,860.00	3,250.00	
Georgia 1	104,360.28	104,360.28	-----	51,200.28	8,750.00	6,800.00	8,000.00	17,500.00	36,098.77	-----	
Hawaii.....	75,460.99	75,460.99	-----	-----	5,856.00	-----	13,168.70	18,942.00	8,850.00	-----	
Idaho.....	78,871.76	75,871.76	-----	30,903.76	17,176.00	45,913.51	17,492.00	63,172.00	-----	-----	
Illinois.....	156,905.51	156,905.51	-----	-----	30,328.00	-----	-----	48,140.59	-----	-----	
Indiana.....	109,244.59	109,244.59	-----	7,104.00	54,000.00	18,585.00	5,673.00	10,923.00	9,847.00	-----	
Iowa.....	96,145.67	96,145.67	-----	27,831.00	23,286.67	17,121.00	9,992.00	20,227.00	13,934.00	-----	
Kansas.....	89,005.70	89,005.70	-----	-----	25,731.70	2,100.00	2,000.00	2,400.00	3,890.00	630.50	
Kentucky 1	99,374.97	99,374.97	-----	28,610.87	59,743.60	13,706.28	14,631.00	18,523.85	8,413.92	-----	
Louisiana 1	96,768.55	96,768.55	-----	28,128.75	13,364.75	4,956.70	6,332.58	23,316.36	9,608.87	-----	
Maine.....	79,115.06	79,115.06	-----	4,956.70	26,449.03	23,000.00	12,000.00	40,872.85	8,000.00	-----	
Maryland 1	93,371.85	93,371.85	-----	9,499.00	-----	23,000.00	12,000.00	40,441.23	18,630.00	-----	
Massachusetts 1	116,788.72	116,788.72	166.00	1,782.82	29,078.00	12,872.00	13,384.67	40,441.23	3,100.00	-----	
Michigan.....	133,559.50	133,559.50	-----	14,700.00	28,940.00	11,409.00	12,337.00	76,819.50	3,100.00	-----	
Minnesota.....	99,750.80	99,750.80	-----	13,277.00	31,311.00	17,209.80	10,144.21	12,905.00	14,540.80	3,971.00	
Mississippi 1	91,735.06	91,735.06	-----	6,009.00	20,047.00	17,209.80	22,329.23	22,329.23	14,245.82	1,750.00	
Missouri 1	109,446.30	103,865.96	6,080.34	2 9,289.25	2 65,123.47	9,274.90	2 2,733.14	2 19,467.41	2 3,207.26	2 360.87	
Missouri 1	75,895.57	75,895.57	-----	13,874.94	22,029.13	8,075.00	5,833.30	15,666.60	10,416.60	-----	
Montana.....	83,222.20	83,222.20	-----	-----	83,222.20	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	
Nebraska.....	83,222.20	83,222.20	-----	6,770.12	23,015.00	4,511.68	28,156.31	9,143.75	9,619.18	-----	
Nevada.....	71,596.86	71,596.86	-----	-----	21,500.00	36,500.00	-----	7,700.00	7,700.00	-----	
New Hampshire.....	75,319.18	75,319.18	-----	-----	20,000.00	18,000.00	8,000.00	33,233.27	5,000.00	-----	
New Jersey.....	118,233.27	118,233.27	-----	34,000.00	20,000.00	6,108.00	4,608.00	15,850.00	5,700.00	-----	
New Mexico.....	76,794.96	76,728.00	66.96	24,284.96	20,244.00	25,000.00	-----	8,000.00	-----	-----	
New York.....	217,188.69	210,305.03	6,883.66	2 86,428.40	97,760.29	7,047.00	10,000.00	7,471.10	1,500.00	2,000.00	
North Carolina 1	110,518.47	110,518.47	-----	32,500.00	60,934.43	-----	-----	7,945.83	7,300.72	-----	
North Dakota.....	76,180.98	76,180.98	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 6.

Expenditures of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds, by field, year ended June 30, 1959 (from Federal funds appropriated for instruction at land-grant colleges and universities)—Continued

State	Expenditures			Expenditures by subject-matter field							Special preparation of teachers (11)
	Total (2)	Salaries (3)	Facilities (4)	Agriculture (5)	Mechanic arts (6)	English language (7)	Mathematical science (8)	Natural and physical science (9)	Economic science (10)		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	
Ohio.....	\$149,269.02	\$149,269.02		\$15,070.02	\$62,503.00	\$41,992.24	\$20,856.00	\$88,847.76			
Oklahoma.....	92,278.07	92,278.07		29,528.80	13,000.00	3,000.00	12,943.00	24,406.27	\$9,400.00		
Oregon.....	85,175.65	85,175.65		28,000.00	16,600.00	3,175.65	5,200.00	22,300.00	9,900.00		
Pennsylvania.....	174,719.55	174,719.55		11,004.00	62,004.00	23,356.00	9,392.00	68,963.55			
Puerto Rico.....	50,000.21	50,000.21		50,000.21							
Rhode Island.....	77,899.30	77,899.30		12,721.30	19,417.00	9,132.00	13,125.00	16,332.00	7,172.00		
South Carolina ¹	91,117.72	91,117.72		6,000.00	35,253.72	15,148.00	13,214.00	9,752.00	6,250.00	5,500.00	
South Dakota.....	76,511.20	76,511.20			27,166.64	11,978.00	11,888.88	25,477.68			
Tennessee ¹	102,835.48	98,175.48	4,660.00	2 17,384.77	2 13,564.71	2 8,500.00	2 15,000.00	2 40,800.00	2 7,586.00		
Texas ¹	146,920.54	54,083.40	92,837.14	2 35,756.00	2 34,005.00		2 117.00	2 75,150.54	2 306.00	1,586.00	
Utah.....	76,871.52	76,871.52		8,130.00	7,700.04	18,616.44	12,050.04	14,499.96	15,875.04		
Vermont.....	73,768.09	73,768.09		9,541.24	18,000.00		14,726.85	16,000.00	15,500.00		
Virginia ¹	103,104.43	103,104.43		12,647.05	29,119.10	12,731.15	12,949.11	23,776.64	11,881.38		
Washington.....	93,730.58	93,730.58				40,351.63		53,378.95			
West Virginia.....	90,005.74	88,038.24	1,967.50			2 10,304.52	15,666.50	2 64,034.72	2 4,564.62		
Wisconsin.....	104,260.50	96,668.92	7,591.58	2 27,366.88	46,322.96	16,644.00	8,500.00	17,506.04			
Wyoming.....	72,898.08	72,898.08					8,914.00	33,852.08	13,488.00		

¹ Includes expenditures for the 2 land-grant institutions in this State.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, Apr. 26, 1960.

IMPORTANCE OF THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities constitute fewer than 5 percent of all the institutions of higher education of all kinds in the United States, and they enroll more than 21 percent of all the students in 4-year colleges and universities. But their significance is out of all proportion to their enrollment. They train 100 percent of all those who receive doctor's degrees in agriculture and more than 80 percent of all those getting bachelor's degrees.

In the basic biological sciences, they grant 56 percent of all doctor's degrees—the level of training required for research, and over 50 percent at the master's degree level, required for secondary teaching in this important field. Ninety-five percent of all entomologists in this country, the men and women who deal with our insect pests, get their first degrees at land-grant institutions, as do 55 percent of all people who start out in bacteriology and its related fields so essential in both agriculture and in the health sciences. About 37 percent of all students who later go into medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry get their first degrees at land-grant institutions. At the doctor's degree level of professional training these institutions graduate 93 percent of all so trained in the United States.

Thirty percent of all those who get master's degrees in mathematics in the United States—the level required for secondary school teaching—get these degrees at land-grant institutions; while at the doctoral level required for high level research and college teaching the figure is more than 39 percent. In the related field of statistics, the land-grant institutions grant 48 percent of all first degrees and nearly 60 percent of all doctoral degrees.

In engineering, 41 percent of all engineers receiving their first degrees in the United States come from land-grant institutions; while at the doctor's degree level the figure is nearly 53 percent. And 72 percent of all the forestry students in the country get their degrees in the land-grant group.

In the basic physical sciences: The land-grant institutions give 42 percent of all doctoral degrees in all fields, including 36 percent of all physicists, 40 percent of all chemists, and 73 percent of all geologists.

MILITARY TRAINING

There is another teaching area in which the land-grant college system is of great importance—the field of military science and tactics. The act of July 2, 1862, requires that institutions established thereunder must include training in military tactics. Although there was no formal way in which this training could lead to formal status in the Armed Forces prior to the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920 which founded the ROTC program, the records show that at least 100,000 men who had military training on land-grant institutions served in World War I, and that 30,000 of them became officers. Between World War I and World War II, the land-grant institutions furnished annually from 50 to 70 percent of all young men receiving commissions via the Reserve Officers Training Corps program. General Marshall is authority for the statement that mobilization in World War II would have been delayed at least 6 months without the availability of these men. President Eisenhower, while Chief of Staff of the Army, made a similar observation.

Since World War II there has been a vast expansion of the number of colleges and universities offering military training: but the land-grant institutions, at a conservative estimate, still furnish substantially more than a third of all Regular and Reserve officers not supplied by the military academies.

HEARINGS

Hearings were held on two identical bills (H.R. 10876 by Mr. Cooley, reported herewith, and H.R. 10974 by Mr. Dixon). At the hearings spokesmen for the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities and general farm organizations appeared in favor of the bill. In addition, statements or communications in favor of the legislation were received from several Members of Congress and from the presidents of approximately 35 State universities. There were no witnesses in opposition to the bill.

DEPARTMENTAL POSITION

The Department of Agriculture made no recommendation as to the enactment of the bill, pointing out in its letter that it relates to a provision of law administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In its letter, however, the Department of Agriculture stated that "strengthening the resident teaching program at the land-grant institutions would be of direct benefit to this Department" and that "because of the growing complexity and increased dependence on science and technology and all phases of agriculture, there will be an increased demand for technically trained personnel."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, took a position in opposition to the bill, apparently because the bill does not make funds available to all institutions of higher education. At the same time this Department states in its report that "any Federal aid to higher education should be pinpointed toward higher priority needs." It is the opinion of this committee that the bill reported herewith does exactly that.

Following are the texts of the reports from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: This is in reply to your request of March 4, for a report on H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

This Department makes no recommendation as to the enactment of this bill since it relates to a provision of law administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The primary purpose of this bill is to authorize increased appropriations in the form of grant funds for resident teaching at land grant institutions. It would also authorize the University of Puerto Rico to participate in the benefits of the program on the same basis as the

States. The basic legislation would not be modified in other respects. Specific conditions contained in the bill are as follows: (1) Increases the amount to be equally distributed to States from \$1 million each fiscal year to \$7,650,000; and (2) Increases the amount to be distributed annually on the basis of relative population from \$1,501,500 each fiscal year to \$4,300,000.

While we have no information as to the need for larger Federal grants, strengthening the resident teaching program at the land grant institutions would be of direct benefit to this Department by improving the quality of instruction and probably by increasing the number of students who would be trained in agricultural subjects. This, of course, is very important because of the high percentage of employees recruited by this Department from these institutions. The need for more persons trained in agriculture is increasing. Commercial organizations in recent years have expanded their recruitment programs in the land grant institutions and this had made it increasingly difficult to attract agriculturally trained students for positions in this Department.

Continuing scientific progress in all areas affecting agriculture will require a progressive increase in the number of technically trained people with farm and agricultural college background. Shortages in the biological sciences are just as great as they are in physics, engineering, and other technical fields. Because of the growing complexity and increased dependence on science and technology in all phases of agriculture, there will be an increasing demand for technically trained personnel beyond that required in Federal, State, and industrial research. The increasing amount of basic research in the Department of Agriculture and at the agricultural experiment station also calls for more specialized training on the graduate level.

It is our understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will comment on H.R. 10876 from the standpoint of the general relationship of the Federal Government to institutions of higher learning.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
May 23, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of March 23, 1960, for a report on H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

This bill would amend section 22 (7 U.S.C. 329) of the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935, as amended, to increase the authorization for annual appropriations for Federal grants to the States for the support of resident teaching in land-grant colleges and universities,

and to include Puerto Rico in the provisions of the act. The existing authorization of \$1 million, allotted equally among the States, would be increased to \$7,650,000; the authorization of \$1,501,500, allotted on the basis of relative State population, would be increased to \$4,300,000. Thus the total increase in authorized annual appropriations for these purposes would be \$9,448,500.

Annual appropriations for a grant of \$50,000 to each State to be applied to instruction in land-grant institutions are also authorized by the second (1890) Morrill Act, as amended. Puerto Rico is eligible to receive these grants. The funds made available under the Bankhead-Jones and the second Morrill Acts may be used only for "instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and in the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic science, * * * and to facilities for such instruction." The appropriations authorized under both acts for these purposes total \$5,051,500. The proposed increase in the section 22 authorization would increase the total authorization of appropriations for this purpose by approximately 140 percent.

We are, of course, fully aware of the immeasurable contribution which our land-grant institutions have made and are making to the cause of higher education in this country. However, we do not believe that additional Federal appropriations limited to this particular group of institutions can be justified in the light of present-day needs in higher education and in the light of the contribution that many other institutions of higher education, public and private, can make in meeting these needs. Any Federal aid to higher education should be pinpointed toward high priority needs and should be made available to any qualified institution of higher education able and willing to do its part in meeting these needs. This basic principle underlies the National Defense Education Act and all legislative proposals which this administration has made or endorsed in aid of higher education, including its pending proposal for Federal assistance in the construction of housing and academic facilities (H.R. 4267 and H.R. 4415).

For these reasons we are unable to recommend enactment of H.R. 10876.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

ACT OF JUNE 29, 1935, AS AMENDED (7 U.C.S. 329)

* * * * * *

[§ 329. Additional appropriation for agricultural colleges.

[In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii entitled to the benefits of sections 301–305, 307 and 308 of this title, there are authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

[(a) For the fiscal year beginning after June 29, 1935, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$1,000,000; and

[(b) For the fiscal year following the first fiscal year for which an appropriation is made in pursuance of paragraph (a) of this section \$500,000, and for each of the two fiscal years thereafter \$500,000 more than the amount authorized to be appropriated for the preceding fiscal year, and for each fiscal year thereafter \$1,501,500. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) of this section shall be paid annually to the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of this paragraph shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) of this section and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii in the proportion which the total population of each such State and Territory bears to the total population of all the States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under sections 301–305, 307 and 308 of this title, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such sections. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under sections 321–326 and 328 of this title, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section. (June 29, 1935, ch. 338, § 22, 49 Stat. 439; June 12, 1952, ch. 419, §§ 1–4, 66 Stat. 135.)]

SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled "An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301–328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled "An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862," approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section.



Calendar No. 1658

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3450

[Report No. 1596]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 29, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill ; which was read twice
and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 16, 1960

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, without amendment

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended
4 (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

5 “SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete
6 endowment and support of the colleges in the several States
7 and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled
8 ‘An Act donating public lands to the several States and
9 Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of

1 agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862,
2 as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there
3 are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of
4 any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the
5 following amounts:

6 “(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
7 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
8 \$7,650,000; and

9 “(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of
10 enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter,
11 \$4,300,000.

12 “The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a)
13 shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico
14 in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of
15 paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in
16 pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid
17 annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the
18 proportion to which the total population of each State and
19 Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States
20 and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decen-
21 nial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section
22 shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized
23 under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supple-
24 mented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the
25 colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented.

1 The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of
2 sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of
3 the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endow-
4 ment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agricul-
5 ture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions
6 of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved
7 August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply
8 to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance
9 of this section."

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3450

[Report No. 1596]

A BILL

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

By Mr. ELLENDER

APRIL 29, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

JUNE 16, 1960

Reported without amendment

June 18, 1960

easements, or rights-of-way as needed in connection with works of improvements installed with Federal assistance. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 12265

25. POSTAL RATES. Passed as reported H. R. 4595, to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials. pp. 12265-6
26. TRANSPORTATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10840, to amend Public Law 85-626 relating to dual rate contract agreements. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 12266
Passed over, at the request of Sen. Hart, S. 3278, to amend the Housing Act of 1954, to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas. p. 12275
27. INFORMATION. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 696 (in lieu of S. J. Res. 187), designating September 1960 as "National Wool Month." This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 12267
28. OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Hart, S. 2692, to advance the marine sciences; to establish a comprehensive ten-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; and to expand ocean resources, etc. p. 12267
29. MINERALS. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Prouty, H. R. 10455, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920. p. 12270
30. FOOD ADDITIVES; ADMINISTRATIVE ORDERS. Passed without amendment H. R. 7847, to make the uniform law relating to the record on review of agency orders (Public Law 85-791) applicable to the judicial review of orders issued under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 12272
31. DESERT LANDS. Passed without amendment H. R. 11706, to authorize an extension of time of final proof of qualifications of certain entrymen under the desert land laws. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 12272
32. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Passed as report H. R. 12052, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 for an additional 2 years. p. 12272
33. FARM LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 6456, H. R. 6498, and H. R. 6529, to exempt certain debts owed by members of the Crow Creek Sioux, the Standing Rock Sioux, and the Lower Brule Sioux, respectively, to the tribes and to the U. S. (including certain Farmers Home Administration Loans) from being treated as an offset against compensation received by them for land taken in connection with the construction of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir project. These bills will now be sent to the President. p. 12273
34. CONTRACTS. Passed as reported S. 3487, to amend the "anti-Kickback Statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts. p. 12274
35. GOVERNMENT VEHICLES. Passed as reported H. R. 766, to amend existing laws so as to modify the strict penalty provision in title 5 U. S. Code, for the use of Government-owned vehicles and aircraft for other than official purposes, and to give to the heads of departments or agencies the discretion of fixing the disciplinary action in any given case. p. 12275

36. BOTANIC GARDEN. Passed as reported S. 2919, to authorize the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to have a study and investigation made of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden in Hawaii. p. 12275
-
37. LAND-GRANT COLLEGES. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Hart, S. 3450, relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, to increase the authorized appropriations for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. p. 12275
-
38. LAND EASEMENT. Passed without amendment S. 3665, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the Trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns. pp. 12275-6
39. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Hart, this bill, H. R. 12232. p. 12277
40. HOUSING. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Hart, S. 3292, to provide for the establishment of a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs. p. 12277
41. REPORTS. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 899, to provide for the discontinuance of certain reports now required by law (including certain reports relating to foot-and-mouth disease, experiment stations, and extension work of this Department). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 12280-2
42. PUBLICATIONS. Passed without amendment S. 3579, to authorize agencies of the Government of the U. S. to pay in advance for required publications. pp. 12273-4
43. SMALL BUSINESS. Sen. Proxmire urged consideration of his bill which would require the Defense Department to clear all substantial contracts with the Small Business Administration to give small businesses equal opportunity on their contracts. p. 12256
44. PUBLIC DEBT; TAXATION. Continued debate on H. R. 12381, to extend for 1 year the public debt limit and the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates. pp. 12277, 12282-310, 12312-73
45. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 20. p. 12283

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

46. PERSONNEL. Speech in the House by Rep. Roosevelt favoring pay increases for Federal employees. p. A5134
47. PUBLIC WORKS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Weaver inserting a report to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress suggesting various water resource projects to be included in the Government's public works program. pp. A5141-3
48. GRAIN STORAGE. Rep. Yates inserted an article, "Keeping Grain Storage Costs Down." pp. A5151-2
Rep. Yates inserted an editorial in support of his proposal which would require maximum utilization of Government-owned storage. pp. A5167-8
49. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Teague inserting an article which states that "two leaders of farmer organizations today contended Mexican

or interest in land with respect to which such application was filed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, the term "former owner" means the person from whom any land or interest in land referred to in subsection (a) of the first section of this Act was acquired by the United States; or if any such person is deceased, his spouse; or if such spouse is also deceased, one or more of his natural or adopted children.

SEC. 4. No application shall be received by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Act after one year from the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENALTIES FOR USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED VEHICLES FOR OTHER THAN OFFICIAL PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 766) to amend section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, relating to penalties for the use of Government-owned vehicles for other than official purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment on page 1, after line 9, to strike out:

Any officer or employee of the Government who willfully uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned vehicle or aircraft, or of any vehicle or aircraft leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be subject to such disciplinary action as the head of the department concerned or his representative may prescribe, which disciplinary action may include removal from his position, if circumstances warrant.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Any officer or employee of the Government who willfully uses or authorizes the use of any Government-owned vehicle or aircraft, or of any vehicle or aircraft leased by the Government, for other than official purposes or otherwise violates the provisions of this subsection shall be suspended from duty by the head of the department concerned, without compensation, for not less than one month, and shall be suspended for a longer period or summarily removed from office if circumstances warrant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

NATIONAL TROPICAL BOTANIC GARDEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2919) to provide that the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution shall study and investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President of the United States is authorized to have a complete study and investigation made of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden to be

located in the State of Hawaii for the purpose of research and education concerning tropical flora, and for the instruction and recreation of the people. The study and investigation may be made by such departments or agencies as the President may designate.

SEC. 2. There shall be submitted to Congress, within one year after funds are made available to conduct the study and investigation authorized by this Act, a report of the findings of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as are deemed appropriate. Such report shall contain, but shall not be limited to, specific findings with respect to (1) which department or agency of the Federal Government would be best suited to establish and maintain the botanic garden referred to in the first section of this Act, and (2) the estimated cost to the United States of establishing and maintaining such a botanic garden.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$5,000 as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill providing for a study and investigation of the desirability and feasibility of establishing and maintaining a national tropical botanic garden."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3672) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3278) to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this bill is a very desirable one; but I must ask that it go over, by reason of the fact that it is not appropriate for disposition during the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2917) to establish a price support level for milk and butterfat was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, let me say that this bill, too, is a very desirable one; but, again, I must ask that the bill go over, by reason of the fact that it is not appropriate for disposition during the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS AND RESERVATIONS IN CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

The bill (H.R. 11952) to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which authorized and

directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS OF GRADE AND STAPLE LENGTH OF COTTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 11646) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, as amended, by defining certain offenses in connection with the sampling of cotton for classification and providing a penalty provision, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after "(c)", to strike out "for any person to alter, or cause to be altered, any sample taken for classification under this Act by any means such as trimming, peeling, or dressing the sample, or by removing any leaf, trash, dust, or other material from the sample" and insert "for any person knowingly to alter or cause to be altered a sample taken for classification under this Act by any means such as trimming, peeling, or dressing the sample, or by removing any leaf, trash, dust, or other material from the sample for the purpose of misrepresenting the actual quality of the bale from which the sample was taken".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3450) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, again, it is a desirable bill, but certainly not appropriate for calendar action. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

EASEMENT OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CINCINNATI SOUTHERN RAILWAY

The bill (S. 3665) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors, and assigns was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon

such terms as he may deem advisable, to grant and convey by proper instrument a perpetual easement to the trustees of the Cincinnati Southern Railway, their successors and assigns, in, upon, across, and over national forest lands and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the line of railway incident to the relocation of its main line between Tateville, Kentucky, and Flat Rock, Kentucky, and for any related purposes deemed appropriate by the Secretary: *Provided*, That such easement (a) shall be granted only upon a finding by the Secretary that it will not be incompatible with the public interest, (b) shall not include any more land than is reasonably necessary for the purpose for which granted, (c) shall include provisions for payment of adequate compensation, and (d) may include a right to use from the subject lands materials and products for the construction and maintenance of authorized improvements thereon upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor.

SEC. 2. All or any part of such easement may be annulled or forfeited by declaration of the Secretary for failure to comply with the terms of the grant or for nonuse for a period of two consecutive years or abandonment of rights granted under authority hereof.

TREATMENT OF BASIC AGRICULTURE COMMODITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3117) to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 374(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1374(b)), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 374(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary shall by appropriate regulations provide for the remeasurement upon request by the farm operator of the acreage planted to such commodity on the farm and for the measurement of the acreage planted to such commodity on the farm remaining after any adjustment of excess acreage hereunder and shall prescribe the conditions under which the farm operator shall be required to pay the county committee for the expense of the measurement of adjusted acreage or the expense of remeasurement after the initial measurement or the measurement of adjusted acreage. The regulations shall also provide for the refund of any deposit or payment made for the expense of the remeasurement of the initially determined acreage or the adjusted acreage when because of an error in the determination of such acreage the remeasurement brings the acreage within the allotment or permitted acreage or results in a change in acreage in excess of a reasonable variation normal to measurements of acreage of the commodity. Unless the requirements for measurement of adjusted acreage are met by the farm operator, the acreage prior to such adjustment as determined by the county committee shall be considered the acreage of the commodity on the farm in determining whether the applicable farm allotment has been exceeded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF MINIMUM MARKETING QUOTA FOR EXTRA LONG STAPLE COTTON

The bill (H.R. 12115) to extend the minimum national marketing quota for extra long staple cotton to the 1961 crop was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE VILLAGE OF HIGHLAND FALLS, N.Y.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6479) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y., which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "at", to strike out "50 per centum of the".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3473) to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over, and I also ask the Calendar No. 1664, H.R. 12381, which is the pending business, also go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar Nos. 1666 and 1664 will be passed over.

QUIET TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN THE NEZ PERCE INDIAN RESERVATION, IDAHO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2711) to quiet title to certain lands within the Nez Perce Indian Reservation, Idaho, and for other purposes, which has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 3. This Act shall become effective upon entry of the Nez Perce Tribe into a stipulation in litigation now pending before the Indian Claims Commission under section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049) that this land is not involved in such litigation.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the lands within the Nez Perce Reservation, Idaho, now reserved for agency, school, or cemetery purposes is hereby declared to be held in trust for the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, subject to the right of the United States to use said lands for agency, school, or administrative purposes.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as confirming or denying the claim that said lands have, since 1865 and up to the effective date of this Act been held in trust by the United States for the Nez Perce Tribe.

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRUSTEESHIP OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR THE CHEYENNE RIVER SIOUX TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4786) declaring certain lands to be held in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of Indians of South Dakota, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN TRUST TO THE CITIZEN BAND OF POTAWATOMI INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7990) to convey certain land of the United States in trust to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians of Oklahoma, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 57.99 acres of land more particularly described in section 2 of this Act, subject to the right of the Absentee Shawnee of Oklahoma, Sac and Fox of Oklahoma, Kickapoo of Oklahoma, and Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma to use the Potawatomi community house that may be constructed and maintained thereon. The title of the tribe thereto shall be subject to

June 23, 1960

Alaska, for use ... as a Nike range"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 13090

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack stated that on Thurs., June 30, the Private Calendar will be called (p. 13035), and that, under a unanimous consent agreement, any vote on Sat., June 25, would be postponed until Mon., June 27 (p. 13071).

SENATE

12. HUMANE SLAUGHTER. Passed without amendment H. R. 12705, to extend for 60 days until August 30, 1960, the time during which slaughterers and processors, who have contracted for the purchase of the equipment necessary to enable them to comply with the provisions of the Humane Slaughter Act, may have to comply with the provisions of the Act (p. 12945). Earlier this bill had been reported without amendment by the Agriculture and Forestry Committee (no written report) (p. 12939). This bill will now be sent to the President.
13. SALINE WATER. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 3557, to expand and extend the saline water conversion research program (S. Rept. 1668). p. 12939
14. WILDLIFE. Passed with amendment H. R. 2565, to promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reservations (pp. 12954-6). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Allott to exempt all provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act from provisions of this bill (p. 12956).
15. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 2587, to require an Act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government (S. Rept. 1669). p. 12939
16. RESEARCH. Passed with amendment S. 2692, to establish a ten-year oceanographic research program. pp. 12975-89
17. WATER RESOURCES; INTERNATIONAL DAM. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 12263, to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the U. S. and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande, in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of Feb. 3, 1944 (S. Rept. 1670). p. 13939
18. RYUKYU ISLANDS. The Armed Services Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 1157, providing for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. p. D600
19. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 12231, the military construction appropriation bill for 1961. p. D600
20. VETERANS' BENEFITS. The Armed Services Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 5040, to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. p. D600
21. MINERALS. Sen. Allott inserted a short summary of the Senate passed bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920. p. 12972

22. **MUTUAL SECURITY.** Sen. Wiley stated, regarding the mutual security program cuts made by the House, "The Senate, I believe, will need to make restoration of such funds as are deemed essential to carry on our foreign and defense policies, in the interest of mutual security and peace," and inserted an article and a number of letters to back his position. pp. 12945-7
23. **LAND-GRANT COLLEGES.** S. 3450, a bill to increase the authorized appropriation resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions was made the unfinished business. p. 13012

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. **ROADS.** Rep. Wright inserted an article on the total highway program and its principles, "The Gathering Storm in Highways." p. A5415
25. **FARM LABOR.** Extension of remarks of Rep. Smith, Miss., discussing the "so-called consultant's report" on farm labor problems and stating that "it is inconceivable that actions should be based on the recommendations of four men who were picked because they knew so little about the problem," and inserting a Miss. Delta Council letter and analysis of the Mexican farm labor problem. pp. A5429-31

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. **CONTRACTS.** S. 3726, by Sen. McNamara (for himself, Sen. Clark, and Sen. Randolph), to eliminate discriminatory employment practices for reasons of age by Federal Government contractors and subcontractors; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of Sen. McNamara. pp. 12942-3
27. **FOREIGN CURRENCIES.** H. R. 12794, by Rep. Burleson, to provide that additional information shall be included in certain reports relating to the use of foreign currencies; to Foreign Affairs Committee.

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED BY THIS OFFICE

28. **DEFENSE PRODUCTION.** S. 3472, to extend the Defense Production Act, as amended, for an additional 2 years. S. Banking and Currency Committee.
29. **FARM LABOR.** H. R. 9872 and 10378, to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural workers. H. Education and Labor Committee.
30. **PERSONNEL.** H. R. 7758 and 10695, improve administration of overseas activities of the Government of the U. S., and provide for the rotation in overseas assignments of certain civilian employees. S. Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
31. **FOOD ADDITIVES.** H. R. 7624 and S. 2197, to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics. H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
32. **PURCHASING.** Government procurement -- 1960. S. Select Committee on Small Business.
33. **LABOR STANDARDS.** Part 3, minimum wage-hour legislation (including appendix). H. Education and Labor Committee.

ate bill 1543, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to include in certificates of public convenience and necessity limitations on the type and extent of services authorized; Calendar No. 1663, Senate bill 3473, to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; and Calendar No. 1658, Senate bill 3450, to amend section 22—relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts—of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

We expect that other bills will be cleared for action.

It should be assumed that any measure on the calendar may be subject to consideration on motion on any day between now and final adjournment.

The policy committee will meet tomorrow.

There are some general measures which involve policy which we would like to review—some that the minority has already cleared, but we have not cleared; and some that we have cleared, but the minority has not cleared.

I hope we can take up some conference reports this week. A number of bills are in conference.

If I can obtain agreement, perhaps this week we shall consider another appropriation bill.

We shall consider the Amistad Dam bill tomorrow, if the report on the bill is filed tonight.

But I do not anticipate any major legislative measures just now. Of course, sometimes a minor bill is more trouble to handle than a major appropriation bill.

So far as I can tell, most of these bills must be passed by motion, but are not measures on which one would anticipate the necessity for a ye-and-nay vote.

Unless an argument develops over them, or unless some Senator wishes to have a quorum call, I anticipate no reason why all Senators should remain here this evening. I shall be here; but I would not suggest that the Senator from Iowa cancel any engagement in order to remain here, although the session this evening will continue for a while.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Texas. I repeat that I was not asking about the program for tomorrow.

It happens that there are one or two things which I may look after this evening. But if votes are anticipated, I shall plan to be here, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I realize that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But I could not hold the Senator from Texas to any firm commitment, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I realize the Senator's attitude, and it is appreciated.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But if the Senator from Texas anticipates that a vote will be taken this evening—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not.

Let me say that any question the Senator from Iowa may choose to address to me will be cordially received, for I have the greatest respect and friendship for him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was merely inquiring about the prospects for the session this evening.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not anticipate any very important action this evening. Of course, if the situation became too heated, I might move that the Senate go over until tomorrow, in order to protect Senators.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say that of the bills which have been mentioned for possible consideration tonight, insofar as I know, all of them have been approved on the minority side, and I know of no controversy regarding them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while a number of Senators are on the floor, I should like to ask the majority leader about the time for convening the session tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall give the Senator from Illinois that information as soon as I can check with two committee chairmen. We have no requests here; and as soon as I am able to obtain the information I need, I shall inform the Senator. So far as I can tell at this time, it is anticipated that the Senate will convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow. But I shall inform the Senator more definitely within 5 minutes.

FRANCIS M. HAISCHER

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, is any business pending at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1441, House bill 1600, for the relief of Francis M. Haischer.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to relieve Francis M. Haischer of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$2,037.72, which represents overpayment of retired pay which was paid by the Navy Department, which he received in good faith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1600) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDA FELLER

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1450, Senate bill 817, for the relief of Freda Feller.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word

"of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "\$1,069" and insert "\$882", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Freda Feller, of Minot, North Dakota, the sum of \$882, representing the amount of expenses incurred by her for hospital and medical care from June 13, 1958, to July 10, 1958, at a civilian hospital in Minot, North Dakota, the said Freda Feller having been led to believe, as the result of an administrative error committed by United States Army personnel, that she was entitled as the dependent of a member of the Armed Forces (Donald C. Feller, serial number ER 17473165) to civilian medical care at Government expense: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this bill is for the purpose of paying Freda Feller, of Minot, N. Dak., the sum of \$882 for expenses incurred by her for hospital and medical care from June 13 to July 10, 1958, at a civilian hospital in Minot, N. Dak. She was led to believe, as the result of an administrative error committed by U.S. Army personnel, that she was entitled, as the dependent of a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, to receive civilian medical care at Government expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAM J. BUZZANCA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1523, House bill 6712, for the relief of Sam J. Buzzanca.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6712) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS OF ADDITIONAL PAY FOR SEA DUTY TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1531, House bill 9921, to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement in regard to the purpose of the bill, as set forth in the committee report, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1469) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to validate payments of additional pay for sea duty made prior to June 30, 1956, to enlisted members of the Coast Guard who served on vessels of less than 125 feet in length. The bill would further permit the refund of any repayments made by any of those men relating to those payments received in the above manner, and relieve the authorized certifying officers from accountability for such payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 9921) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 807 ENTITLED "FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF MANUAL"—RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1392, Senate Resolution 281, authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 807, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual," be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 3307 TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1570, Senate Resolution 331, referring Senate bill 3307 to the Court of Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief explanation of the resolution.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this resolution is to refer S. 3307, a bill for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp., to the Court of Claims for finding of fact and conclusions thereon, sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 331) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3307) entitled "A bill for the relief of Rocky River Company

and Macy Land Corporation", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1935 TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1589, Senate Resolution 332, referring Senate bill 1935 to the Court of Claims.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief explanation of the purpose of the resolution.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to refer the bill, S. 1935, to the Court of Claims and to authorize the court to report to the Senate such findings of fact and conclusions of law as will enable the Senate to determine what amount, if any, is legally or equitably due the claimants from the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 332) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1935) entitled "A bill for the relief of Fred Foster and George Morris, doing business as Independent Cab Company; and for the relief of Pulaski Cab Company, Incorporated," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amounts, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

BETTY KEENAN

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1594, House bill 5033.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5033) for the relief of Betty Keenan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to pay to Betty

Keenan, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of \$499.06, as a refund of the amount deducted from her salary as a Federal employee for retirement purposes in the period from December 14, 1942, to January 31, 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESIDENT TEACHING GRANTS TO LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1658, Senate bill 3450.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3450) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR BIBLE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I commend the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], for the loyal and diligent and effective manner in which he has carried on the duties of leadership in my absence. He is always a source of great comfort. I do not know of any Member of this body who is respected more or who contributes more to the efficient functioning of the Senate than does the able Senator from Nevada. Day after day we call upon him to perform services that are not connected with the interests of his State, but are very vital to the national interest, and he always does it in a capable manner and with a pleasant disposition. I want him to know that I always will rely on him. In sunshine and sorrow, I have never been disappointed. I appreciate very much the work he has done.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I say I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the very distinguished majority leader. I think they are unearned, but they are gratifying, and I greatly appreciate them. It is a pleasure to work under the able leadership of LYNDON JOHNSON at any time, and, believe me, I am the one who is rewarded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe what I have said about the Senator from Nevada will be confirmed by every other Member of this body.

June 24, 1960

22. RECREATION FACILITIES. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment S. 3260, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provisions of recreation facilities in reservoir areas (S. Rept. 1724). p. 13095
23. FOREST ROADS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10495, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of highways, including authorization for the construction of forest highways and forest development roads and trails (S. Rept. 1725). p. 13095
24. RYUKYU ISLANDS. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendments H. R. 1157, to provide for promotion of the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands (S. Rept. 1738). p. 13096
25. FINANCE; U. S. OBLIGATIONS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S. 3702, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve Banks to purchase U. S. obligations directly from the Treasury (S. Rept. 1739). p. 13096
26. HAWAII. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 11602, to amend certain laws of the U. S. in light of the admission of Hawaii into the Union (S. Rept. 1681). p. 13095
27. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 2959, to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit (S. Rept. 1726); and with amendment S. 3212, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in Nevada to the county of Mineral (S. Rept. 1727). p. 13095
Received from the Defense Department a proposed bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Army for a Nike range; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 13094
28. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5068, to amend the Shipping Act of 1916 so as to provide for licensing of independent foreign freight forwarders (S. Rept. 1682). p. 13095
29. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 12231 (S. Rept. 1684). p. 13095
30. TRADEMARKS. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 2429, to modify the laws relating to the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce and to carry out provisions of international conventions (S. Rept. 1685). p. 13095
31. PUBLIC WORKS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 202, providing for the designation of the week commencing Oct. 2, 1960, as National Public Works Week (S. Rept. 1687). p. 13095
32. PROPERTY. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11522, to permit certain real property of the U. S. to be conveyed to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions for highway purposes (S. Rept. 1722). p. 13095
33. SALINE WATER. Passed as reported S. 3557, to extend and expand the saline water conversion program of the Department of the Interior. pp. 13142-5

34. WATER RESOURCES; INTERNATIONAL DAM. Passed as reported H. R. 12263, to authorize conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the U. S. and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande. pp. 13145-6
35. EDUCATION; LAND-GRANT COLLEGES. Passed without amendment S. 3450, to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. pp. 13154-6
36. SMALL BUSINESS. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3689, to amend the Small Business Act so as to assure small business a share of defense contracts and to establish a system of grants for research and counseling of small business. p. D607
37. MIGRATORY FARM LABOR. Subcommittees of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee approved for full committee consideration the following bills: p. D608
S. 2864, with amendment, to provide Federal payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural workers;
S. 2865, to provide Federal grants for adult education for migrant agricultural workers;
S. 1778, (amended version), to provide for the registration of crew leaders in interstate agricultural employment;
S. 2498 (amended version), to provide for the registration of contracts of migrant agricultural workers.
38. HOUSING. Sen. Clark inserted an editorial, "Housing Crazy Quilt," and his letter commenting on the editorial, discussing proposed housing legislation, including the VA direct and guaranteed housing programs. pp. 13107-8
39. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. Kennedy urged greater development of our natural resources, including the national forests, water resources, and mineral resources, and stated that "we must modernize the administration of our resource development by bringing together programs which are now often scattered through dozens of different agencies." pp. 13119-21
40. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Wiley inserted resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs on various subjects, including sanitation of milk, meat inspection, and food additives. pp. 13124-6
41. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Long announced that the following bills will be considered Mon., June 27: S. 3275, extension of veterans' loan program, and H. R. 4601, to limit to national security cases the prohibition on payment of annuities to retired employees. p. 13180
42. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 27. pp. 13181-2
- HOUSE - JUNE 25
43. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment S. 3117, to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage allotments (p. 13281). This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar House bill, H. R. 12420, was laid on the table.
44. COLOR ADDITIVES. Passed with amendments H. R. 7624, to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to authorize the use

the gains to be made are very considerable. Therefore, the temptation is great and the risk of discovery is small.

If there is further information you wish, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. MCCONE.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I enclosed in my letter to Mr. McCone two articles by the columnist, Mr. Joseph Alsop, and I asked Mr. McCone—

Can you tell me, therefore, whether you have stated to Mr. Alsop or to any other person that you are convinced that the Soviet Union is, indeed, now or has been during the course of the Geneva test ban negotiations, testing nuclear weapons secretly? If you have made such assertions can you tell me on what evidence you base your conclusions.

I wrote this letter because a great deal of loose talk was going on around the country about the possibility of the violation of a test ban agreement, and I do not believe we ought to countenance such talk if it cannot be backed up by fact. If there are indications that there have been violations of the moratorium, then it is the duty of proper officials to protest and to make this known. If not, it is their duty not to make inconclusive statements which can be subject to misinterpretation.

Mr. McCone, in his reply to my letter, stated:

I have your letter of June 14, enclosing the two articles by Mr. Joseph Alsop and inquiring whether or not I have made statements that the Soviet Union is now or has been conducting clandestine nuclear tests. The most recent comprehensive public statement on the general subject of the test moratorium is contained in the record of the Commission's testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the House Committee on Appropriations on the Atomic Energy Commission's 1961 fiscal year budget request.

In addition to the foregoing, in a recorded TV-tape interview at Troy, N.Y., on June 10, prior to delivering the commencement address at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, I was asked the following question:

"Is there any reason to believe that the Russians are clandestinely testing despite their unilateral [announcement of a moratorium]?"

My response was:

"There is no information on this subject whatsoever. However, my personal views are that the opportunities are great and it is relatively easy to do and there is no possible means of detection. Therefore, I feel that they would be tempted to carry on in the absence of any possibility of getting caught."

The reference to detection in my response was, of course, made in the context of underground nuclear detonations of a magnitude below the capabilities of existing instrumentation.

In summary, I am not aware of the existence of technical evidence which would support a finding that the Soviets have been testing secretly during the moratorium.

I ask that that statement of Mr. McCone's be compared with the following statement of Mr. Alsop:

With his usual forthrightness, McCone has voiced his conviction to the American policymakers and to his British opposite numbers as well.

I submit that Mr. McCone's statement refutes the statement of Mr. Alsop. If Mr. Alsop had said that Mr. McCone may have some feeling that tests are

being made, or that he feels that it is possible that cheating might be underway, that would be one thing. But when the distinguished and noted columnist said that Mr. McCone is "convinced," and that he has expressed this forthrightly to our own policymakers and to our British friends, then I say this is peddling misinformation that prejudices the success of the negotiations at Geneva.

There is, of course, a possibility of cheating. We understand that. That is why some of us have been insisting for years that we should step up our study and our research in the field of detection and inspection.

This is why the Senator from Minnesota insisted that the Berkner report be acted upon. This is why I insisted that the full text of the Berkner report be released after it was kept secret by the Government for months. This is why I have urged that we appropriate more money for seismographic research. This is why I have urged that our NATO allies pool our scientific efforts in the field of detection and inspection. This is why I have urged a type of crash program on the part of our Government in the field of nuclear test detection. This is why I have urged a special agency in the Government.

Despite all those urgings, we go along at a snail's pace. Despite the urgency of the matter we continue to deploy our energies in this country in a debate between those who say that we cannot detect the tests and those who say we can, when it is a fact that there are some tests today that cannot be detected if they are below a certain magnitude, and there are tests above the threshold—above, let us say, a 19-kiloton explosion—that can be detected with existing seismographic instrumentation, plus the fact that suggestions were made, at least theoretically justified or theoretically valid, that would improve the detection immeasurably.

I do not want to enter into an agreement if it is to be filled with boobytraps and loopholes. We do not want an agreement for the sake of an agreement. We must protect our security. We must be sure that we do not lend ourselves to a device or an agreement which would encourage cheating. But on the other hand, if we can get an agreement which will slow down the arms race, which, let us say, could include within it the Chinese mainland, and thereby thwart or check the possibility of nuclear weapons production in China, I think it would be to our national interest, and the only way I know we can do this is to talk responsibly and not to have rumors working the streets of public opinion.

The balance of Mr. McCone's letter states—

However, there is no reliable assurance to the contrary. It is possible to conduct underground tests without detection and the gains to be made are very considerable. Therefore, the temptation is great and the risk of discovery is small.

I wish to thank Mr. McCone for his letter. It was a prompt reply to a direct question. However, the problem of test detection is not solely within the con-

finer of the United States. We have allies. We have friends. We have many ways of detecting tests. I am hopeful, therefore, that we shall continue to pursue the possibilities of an agreement that is safeguarded, and I hope that the half truths that become so much a part of current talk, and so much a part of the Washington cocktail grist mill of rumor and propaganda will be hushed, and that the facts will speak for themselves.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1960]

BACK TO GENEVA

The State Department is making a commendable effort to dissociate disarmament from the international donnybrook of the last month. The calm note promising "most careful and serious study" for the new Soviet disarmament proposal of course offers no more than any thoughtful plan on this subject, Soviet or Western, ought to receive. But dispassionate consideration of disarmament has been made difficult by Mr. Khrushchev's continuing verbal assaults, even though Soviet actions have not paralleled his words.

What the new proposal does, basically, is revise the timing of various stages of arms control so as to meet, superficially at least, several Western objections to previous deficiencies in the control system. It pays ostentatious court to President de Gaulle in calling for the destruction of means of delivery of nuclear weapons, including rockets and bombers, in the first stage. It also calls, not surprisingly, for the abolition of all foreign bases.

One major hitch obviously is that the permanent Control Council would operate in a fashion similar to the United Nations Security Council, with permanent and elected members. Mr. Khrushchev has confirmed that the permanent members would have a veto, which could vitiate effective inspection. Control groups could be stationed at certain installations only "by mutual consent," and this also would leave quite a loophole.

Yet despite many well-warranted doubts about the appearance of control as contrasted with the fact of control, and despite some skepticism about the imminence or feasibility of the idyllic world painted by the Soviet note with no force stronger than a lightly armed militia, the subject is so important that every possibility must be explored and examined. It is possible that the Soviet plan actually contains some advances that could become the basis of further negotiations. It is encouraging that the United States is for the first time seriously studying what is militarily permissible in disarmament.

One index to Soviet intentions will be seen in whether the new plan is used as a springboard for propaganda. An even more immediate index may lie in the Geneva nuclear test negotiations. Considerable progress has been made, before the breakup in Paris and the subsequent Soviet recalcitrance, in narrowing the differences on a test agreement. Without accord on a relatively simple problem on the fringes of disarmament, approaches to the larger problem of real arms control might seem futile.

At the same time the United States could do something more to increase the chance of a test agreement. As this newspaper often has noted, the pulling and hauling in the administration has been such as to whet Soviet suspicions that this country was not serious. Most recently the Russians have objected to the administration's plan for a series of explosions to test underground detection and decoupling, because Soviet sci-

tists will not be permitted to examine the nuclear devices and hence fear that the test may advance military technology.

It may be that the Russians are determined not to acknowledge that there is any possibility of evasion. It may also be that American law would prohibit showing the devices themselves, as apart from the instrumentation, to Soviet scientists. But could not part of this problem be met by inviting the Russians to supply their own nuclear devices of specified force and in equal number for use under their direction in the experiments? Alternately, it might be possible to select the devices to be detonated by lot, or to use British instead of either American or Soviet apparatus. With previously agreed instrumentation this would at least assure that neither side would stand to benefit more than the other. And this sort of joint effort just might hold the key to a more cooperative approach on the larger problems of arms control.

INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR RESIDENT TEACHING GRANTS TO LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3450) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I strongly support S. 3450, which increases the authorization for resident teaching program at land grant institutions. This program was conceived and put into operation through the Morrill Act of 1862. It has, through the years, been a vital instrument in strengthening our educational and research programs, with primary emphasis placed on instruction in agriculture, mechanical arts, and has included courses in military science and tactics.

This bill increases the authorization for land grant institutions by \$9,448,500 but leaves the annual appropriation completely to the discretion of the Appropriations Committee. This is certainly a modest request and will not fully take care of decreases in purchasing power since passage of the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935.

Mr. President, the land grant colleges are making a tremendous contribution to higher education in the United States. Their enrollment has increased from 190,000 in 1935 to a current enrollment of 650,000. Today, more than 21 percent of students in 4-year colleges and universities are enrolled in land grant institutions. These institutions train 100 percent of all those receiving doctor's degrees and 80 percent of these getting bachelor's degrees in agriculture. I am personally proud of their record in the training of students in science. Over 50 percent of all doctor's degrees in basic biological sciences are granted by land grant colleges which also grant over 50 percent of all master's degrees in that field.

An estimated 95 percent of all entomologists in this country obtain their degrees from land grant institutions and 55 percent of all people who start out in bacteriology and its related field also ob-

tain their degrees from these institutions.

It is impressive to note that 35 percent of all students who later go into medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry get their first degrees from land grant institutions.

Another important field of training is military science and tactics, which has been of great value to the defense of our Nation. Between World War I and World War II, the land grant colleges furnished annually from 50 percent to 70 percent of all young men receiving commissions through the Reserve Officers Training Corps. These institutions continue to play a vital part in our military training programs, and I am highly pleased with this outstanding record.

I have first-hand knowledge of land grant colleges and the wonderful contributions which they are making to education, for it was there that I received my first degree—at Mississippi A. & M. College, now known as Mississippi State University.

The funds authorized by this bill will help to strengthen programs in agriculture, mechanical arts, English, mathematics, the natural and physical sciences and economic science at Mississippi State University and other land grant institutions throughout the United States.

This is certainly a modest request for such an important program, and I hope that this bill will receive the full support of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the pending bill would authorize increased appropriations in the form of grant funds for resident teaching at land-grant institutions. It would also authorize the University of Puerto Rico to participate in the benefits of the program on the same basis as the States.

Specifically, with respect to the appropriation authorization the bill would:

First, increase the amount to be equally distributed to States from \$1 million each fiscal year to \$7,650,000; and second, increase the amount to be distributed annually on the basis of relative population from \$1,501,500 each fiscal year to \$4,300,000.

This would amount to a total increase of only \$9,448,500 to be distributed among the 68 land-grant colleges and universities.

Land-grant teaching funds are available for support of instruction in a wide range of basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. The limitation placed on their use by the statutes is that they be expended for teaching and that this teaching be in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto." The interpretation of this language has been broad, as Congress clearly intended it to be, and has permitted support of instruction in the land-grant colleges in accordance with the changing scientific and technical needs of our society. Thus instruction is supported in the basic fields of physical science such as chemistry, physics, and metallurgy, as well as in all the fields of engineering which are based on the application of these subjects. The funds may be used in botany, zoology, bacteriology, and entomology—

the sciences basic to agriculture, as well as in the applied fields of agriculture itself. They may be used for mathematics, essential in all scientific fields, and for basic instruction in English. They may also be used for support of the important and growing field of veterinary medicine, so basic both to human and animal health.

A report from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal 1959 shows the multiple use made of these funds totally and by the individual States.

For example, of the \$5 million total available in fiscal 1959, about \$1.4 million was devoted to engineering, or the mechanic arts; about \$657,000 to English; approximately \$1.3 million to natural and physical sciences; some \$446,000 to mathematical sciences; about \$792,000 to agriculture, and about \$398,000 to economic science and the special preparation of teachers.

Individual States may allocate their funds differently. For example, two States with about the same total expenditures show quite different emphasis in the use of funds. Both Kentucky and Louisiana devote about \$28,000 to agriculture, but Kentucky allocates about \$60,000 to the mechanic arts, and about \$2,000 to \$4,000 to other subjects while Louisiana, on the other hand, allocates only about \$13,000 to the mechanic arts and from \$8,000 to \$18,000 to other subjects. A table can be found on pages 5 and 6 of the report showing individual State use of these funds.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report and a table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY OF THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The national system of land-grant colleges and universities was established by the passage of the first Morrill Act in 1862. Under this act each State was offered grants of Federal land proportionate to its membership in Congress, the land to be sold and the proceeds invested as a permanent endowment fund with the income going for the support of teaching in at least one college in each State. The use of this money for the construction, maintenance, or repair of buildings was prohibited. This college was to emphasize agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto; and to include military tactics in its course offerings. The act provided that other scientific and classical subjects should not be excluded and said that the great objective was the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life.

It was apparently the intention of the Congress at the time of the passage of the first Morrill Act that the income from the national endowment would fully support instruction in these colleges. The States were required to furnish the buildings and equipment, or see that they were furnished. Control over the methods of instruction, etc., was reserved entirely to the States.

As time passed, it became clear that the income from the land endowment would not support the instructional program of the colleges if they were to meet the needs of the young people of their States and of the Nation. Thus State support for instruction, as well as for buildings and equipment, became an increasingly important factor.

In 1890, the Congress recognized that Federal instructional support from the land-endowment investment was far short of what had been contemplated, and passed the second Morrill Act, providing direct annual grants to the colleges for instruction in agriculture, the mechanical arts, and subjects related thereto. This act was passed unanimously in both Houses of Congress. In 1907, it was amended and increased, and constitutes a permanent appropriation act in the amount of \$2,550,000, representing \$50,000 to each State and Puerto Rico for use in supporting instruction in the land-grant institutions of those States.

In 1935, the Congress included in the Bankhead-Jones Act, as authored by this committee, a provision which granted an additional \$20,000 to each State for teaching purposes in its land-grant institutions, and an additional amount which is distributed to each State on the basis of population. The total of funds authorized under this title of the Bankhead-Jones Act is now \$2,501,500, of which \$1 million is distributed on the basis of \$20,000 to each of the 50 States; and the remainder on a population basis. Puerto Rico is not included in this act, but would be included as the act is amended by this bill.

BASIS OF INCREASED AUTHORIZATION

Since 1935 the population of the United States, upon which part of the appointment of land-grant funds is based, has increased 40 percent. Also, since 1935 we have had an inflation of 100 percent. The present total

of annual appropriations to land-grant institutions for teaching purposes from the Morrill Act of 1890, as amended, and the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 is \$5,051,500. The bill would increase that amount by applying the 40-percent population increase factor and the 100-percent inflationary factor to this 1935 level of appropriation. In addition, authorization would be added to permit Puerto Rico to participate on an equal basis with institutions in other States. The second Morrill Act of 1890 is in the nature of a permanent appropriation. Therefore, this bill amends only the Bankhead-Jones Act merely increasing the authorization for this purpose, leaving the actual appropriation to be made in the usual manner through annual appropriation acts.

The committee believes that this is a modest proposal. Had it used as a basis for the increase the increase in enrollment in land-grant institutions since 1935, which was suggested to the committee as being equitable, the increase in authorized appropriations would have been several times as large. Enrollments in the land-grant institutions were about 190,000 in 1935. Of these only 15,000 were in the advanced and highly expensive and important category of graduate students. Currently the enrollments are approximately 650,000, of which 75,000 are graduate students. Thus, there is an increase of 340 percent in total enrollment and an increase of 500 percent in graduate enrollment in these land-grant institutions. Thus, on the

basis of the job the land-grant institutions are doing today, as compared to 1935, an increase in Federal participation of at least \$30 million would have been justified.

USE OF FUNDS

Land-grant teaching funds are available for support of instruction in a wide range of basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. The limitation placed on their use by the statutes is that they be expended for teaching and that this teaching be in "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto." The interpretation of this language has been broad, as Congress clearly intended it to be, and has permitted support of instruction in the land-grant colleges in accordance with the changing scientific and technical needs of our society. Thus instruction is supported in the basic fields of physical science such as chemistry, physics, and metallurgy, as well as in all the fields of engineering which are based on the application of these subjects. The funds may be used in botany, zoology, bacteriology, and entomology—the sciences basic to agriculture, as well as in the applied fields of agriculture itself. They may be used for mathematics, essential in all scientific fields, and for basic instruction in English. They may also be used for support of the important and growing field of veterinary medicine, so basic both to human and animal health.

The following table shows the uses to which these funds were put in the fiscal year 1959.

Expenditures of Morrill-Nelson and Bankhead-Jones funds, by field, year ended June 30, 1959 (from Federal funds appropriated for instruction at land-grant colleges and universities)

State (1)	Expenditures			Expenditures by subject-matter field						
	Total (2)	Salaries (3)	Facilities (4)	Agriculture (5)	Mechanic arts (6)	English language (7)	Mathematical science (8)	Natural and physical science (9)	Economic science (10)	Special preparation of teachers (11)
Total.....	\$5,051,622.73	\$4,919,805.82	\$131,816.91	\$792,445.73	\$1,415,823.04	\$656,806.11	\$446,076.24	\$1,342,139.65	\$370,883.59	\$27,448.37
Alabama ¹	100,541.43	94,349.43	6,192.00	² 14,577.00	² 30,502.00	² 19,868.43	8,560.00	² 19,713.00	7,321.00	-----
Alaska.....	71,283.24	71,283.24	-----	1,422.00	15,841.16	10,113.45	9,441.22	19,943.77	14,521.64	-----
Arizona.....	77,464.26	77,464.26	-----	-----	-----	25,632.26	-----	44,560.00	7,272.00	-----
Arkansas ¹	89,047.71	88,145.65	632.06	² 9,388.48	² 15,646.97	9,733.00	4,199.08	39,695.98	10,383.30	-----
California.....	175,599.47	175,599.47	-----	23,400.00	51,300.00	26,393.97	16,783.15	23,406.25	16,800.00	8,400.00
Colorado.....	83,218.00	83,218.00	-----	-----	16,634.63	16,200.00	6,240.00	27,501.98	8,460.00	-----
Connecticut.....	90,008.98	90,008.98	-----	11,087.00	20,520.00	30,149.68	5,781.00	7,999.92	1,469.67	-----
Delaware ¹	73,172.96	68,433.29	4,739.67	13,270.00	14,502.59	12,101.00	35,452.50	7,183.00	-----	-----
Florida ¹	98,065.51	98,065.51	-----	25,000.13	18,328.88	6,800.00	8,000.00	17,500.00	8,860.00	3,250.00
Georgia ¹	104,360.28	104,360.28	-----	51,200.28	8,750.00	-----	13,168.70	20,367.52	36,068.77	-----
Hawaii.....	75,460.99	75,460.99	-----	-----	5,856.00	-----	-----	18,942.00	8,850.00	-----
Idaho.....	78,871.76	75,871.76	-----	30,903.76	17,176.00	45,913.51	17,492.00	63,172.00	-----	-----
Illinois.....	156,005.51	156,005.51	-----	7,104.00	30,328.00	-----	-----	48,140.59	-----	-----
Indiana.....	109,244.59	109,244.59	-----	27,831.00	54,000.00	18,585.00	5,673.00	10,923.00	9,847.00	-----
Iowa.....	96,145.67	96,145.67	-----	-----	23,286.67	17,121.00	9,992.00	20,227.00	15,934.00	-----
Kansas.....	89,005.70	89,005.70	-----	-----	25,731.70	2,100.00	2,000.00	2,400.00	3,890.00	630.50
Kentucky ¹	99,374.97	99,374.97	-----	28,610.87	59,743.60	13,706.28	14,631.00	18,523.85	8,413.92	-----
Louisiana ¹	96,768.55	96,768.55	-----	28,128.75	13,364.75	8,451.52	6,332.58	23,316.36	9,608.87	-----
Maine.....	79,115.06	79,115.06	-----	4,956.70	26,449.03	23,000.00	12,000.00	40,872.85	8,000.00	-----
Maryland ¹	93,371.85	93,371.85	-----	9,499.00	-----	12,872.00	13,984.67	40,441.23	18,630.00	-----
Massachusetts ¹	116,788.72	116,622.72	166.00	1,782.82	² 29,078.00	-----	-----	76,819.50	3,100.00	-----
Michigan.....	133,559.50	133,559.50	-----	14,700.00	28,940.00	11,409.00	12,337.00	12,905.00	14,540.80	3,971.00
Minnesota.....	99,750.80	99,750.80	-----	13,277.00	31,311.00	17,209.80	10,144.21	22,329.23	14,245.82	1,750.00
Mississippi ¹	91,735.06	91,735.06	-----	6,009.00	20,047.00	9,274.90	² 7,223.14	² 19,467.41	² 3,207.26	² 300.87
Missouri ¹	109,446.30	103,365.96	6,080.34	² 9,289.25	² 65,123.47	8,075.00	5,833.30	15,666.60	10,416.60	-----
Montana.....	75,895.57	75,895.57	-----	13,874.94	22,029.13	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Nebraska.....	83,222.20	83,222.20	-----	-----	83,222.20	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Nevada.....	71,596.86	71,596.86	-----	6,770.12	23,015.00	4,511.68	28,156.31	9,143.75	-----	-----
New Hampshire.....	75,319.18	75,319.18	-----	-----	21,500.00	36,500.00	-----	7,700.00	9,619.18	-----
New Jersey.....	118,233.27	118,233.27	-----	34,000.00	20,000.00	18,000.00	8,000.00	33,233.27	5,000.00	-----
New Mexico.....	76,794.96	76,728.00	66.96	² 24,284.96	20,244.00	6,108.00	4,608.00	15,850.00	5,700.00	-----
New York.....	217,188.69	210,305.03	6,883.66	² 86,428.40	97,760.29	25,000.00	-----	8,000.00	-----	-----
North Carolina ¹	110,518.47	110,518.47	-----	32,500.00	50,000.37	7,047.00	10,000.00	7,471.10	1,500.00	2,000.00
North Dakota.....	76,180.98	76,180.98	-----	-----	60,934.43	-----	-----	7,945.83	7,300.72	-----
Ohio.....	149,269.02	149,269.02	-----	15,070.02	62,503.00	41,992.24	20,856.00	8,847.76	-----	-----
Oklahoma.....	92,278.07	92,278.07	-----	29,528.80	13,000.00	3,000.00	12,943.00	24,406.27	\$9,400.00	-----
Oregon.....	85,175.65	85,175.65	-----	28,000.00	16,600.00	3,175.65	5,200.00	22,300.00	9,900.00	-----
Pennsylvania.....	174,719.55	174,719.55	-----	11,004.00	62,004.00	23,356.00	9,392.00	68,963.55	-----	-----
Puerto Rico.....	50,000.21	50,000.21	-----	50,000.21	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Rhode Island.....	77,899.30	77,899.30	-----	12,721.30	19,417.00	9,132.00	13,125.00	16,332.00	7,172.00	-----
South Carolina ¹	91,117.72	91,117.72	-----	6,000.00	35,253.72	9,154.00	13,214.00	9,752.00	6,250.00	5,500.00
South Dakota.....	76,511.20	76,511.20	-----	-----	27,166.64	11,978.00	11,888.88	25,477.68	-----	-----
Tennessee ¹	102,835.48	98,175.48	4,660.00	² 17,384.77	² 13,564.71	² 8,500.00	² 15,000.00	² 40,800.00	² 7,586.00	-----
Texas ¹	146,920.54	146,920.54	92,837.14	² 35,756.00	² 34,005.00	-----	² 117.00	² 75,150.54	² 306.00	1,586.00
Utah.....	76,871.52	76,871.52	-----	8,130.00	7,700.04	18,616.44	12,050.04	14,499.96	15,875.04	-----
Vermont.....	73,768.09	73,768.09	-----	9,541.24	18,000.00	-----	14,726.85	16,000.00	15,500.00	-----
Virginia ¹	103,104.43	103,104.43	-----	12,647.05	29,119.10	-----	12,949.11	23,776.64	11,881.38	-----
Washington.....	93,730.58	93,730.58	-----	-----	-----	40,351.63	-----	53,378.95	-----	-----
West Virginia.....	90,005.74	88,038.24	1,967.50	-----	-----	² 10,304.52	15,666.50	² 64,034.72	-----	-----
Wisconsin.....	104,260.50	96,668.92	7,591.58	² 27,366.88	46,322.96	-----	8,500.00	17,506.04	² 4,564.62	-----
Wyoming.....	72,898.08	72,898.08	-----	-----	-----	16,644.00	8,914.00	33,852.08	13,488.00	-----

¹ Includes expenditures for the 2 land-grant institutions in this State.
² Includes expenditures for facilities.

IMPORTANCE OF THE LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities constitute fewer than 5 percent of all the institutions of higher education of all kinds in the United States, and they enroll more than 21 percent of all the students in 4-year colleges and universities. But their significance is out of all proportion to their enrollment. They train 100 percent of all those who receive doctor's degrees in agriculture and more than 80 percent of all those getting bachelor's degrees.

In the basic biological sciences, they grant 56 percent of all doctor's degrees—the level of training required for research, and over 50 percent at the master's degree level, required for secondary teaching in this important field. Ninety-five percent of all entomologists in this country, the men and women who deal with our insect pests, get their first degrees at land-grant institutions, as do 55 percent of all people who start out in bacteriology and its related fields so essential in both agriculture and in the health sciences. About 37 percent of all students who later go into medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry get their first degrees at land-grant institutions. At the doctor's degree level of professional training these institutions graduate 93 percent of all so trained in the United States.

Thirty percent of all those who get master's degrees in mathematics in the United States—the level required for secondary school teaching—get these degrees at land-grant institutions; while at the doctoral level required for high level research and college teaching the figure is more than 39 percent. In the related field of statistics, the land-grant institutions grant 48 percent of all first degrees and nearly 60 percent of all doctoral degrees.

In engineering, 41 percent of all engineers receiving their first degrees in the United States come from land-grant institutions; while at the doctor's degree level the figure is nearly 53 percent. And 72 percent of all the forestry students in the country get their degrees in the land-grant group.

In the basic physical sciences: The land-grant institutions give 42 percent of all doctoral degrees in all fields, including 36 percent of all physicists, 40 percent of all chemists, and 73 percent of all geologists.

MILITARY TRAINING

There is another teaching area in which the land-grant college system is of great importance—the field of military science and tactics. The act of July 2, 1862, requires that institutions established thereunder must include training in military tactics. Although there was no formal way in which this training could lead to formal status in the Armed Forces prior to the passage of the National Defense Act of 1920 which founded the ROTC program, the records show that at least 100,000 men who had military training in land-grant institutions served in World War I, and that 30,000 of them became officers. Between World War I and World War II, the land-grant institutions furnished annually from 50 to 70 percent of all young men receiving commissions via the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program. General Marshall is authority for the statement that mobilization in World War II would have been delayed at least 6 months without the availability of these men. President Eisenhower, while Chief of Staff of the Army, made a similar observation. Since World War II there has been a vast expansion of the number of colleges and universities offering military training; but the land-grant institutions, at a conservative estimate, still furnish substantially more than a third of all Regular and Reserve officers not supplied by the military academies.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the

somewhat increased authorization would not mean an enlargement of the program as against the 1935 level?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. It takes account of the inflation which we have had and the deflated value of the dollar. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And also takes into consideration the increase in population.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is the yardstick that was used by those proposing the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

"(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

"(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

"The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACCELERATION OF REFORESTATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1716, Senate Joint Resolution 95.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 95) to provide for the acceleration of the various reforestation programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the joint resolution was reported unanimously by the committee, and has been cleared with the minority.

I want to salute the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for their cooperative effort in bringing before the Senate this resolution on reforestation.

Cosponsoring this resolution in addition to those two Senators are Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Hart, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Murray, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Morse, and our late colleague, Dick Neuberger.

When I spoke on April 20 on the floor of the Senate, I pointed out that had we proceeded under the schedule of the 1950 Anderson-Mansfield Act, we would today have almost completed the job on the national forests.

If we had followed the Clarke-McNary Act principles, the job on small private woodlands would be much, much further along today.

This administration can take scant comfort in its record on reforestation.

Year after year the Congress has added funds for this work, but the administration has not sought an increase. To me, the logic of their position is totally incomprehensible.

I look upon this resolution as an expression by the Congress to the next administration.

I repeat the views I expressed to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I will let others make excuses. For my own part, I reject a policy that says we cannot afford to purposely carry out a program of reforesting our public lands within the next 10 years. Any other course is that of a wastrel of the public interest and a dodger of a public responsibility. Let those with no confidence in our Nation's capabilities record their trepidations and bear the burdens.

I urge we adopt Senate Joint Resolution 95.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

June 29, 1960

24. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11998 (H. Rept. 2040). pp. 13891-3
25. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11389 (H. Rept. 2039). pp. 13893-4
26. RYUKYU ISLANDS. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 1157, providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands (p. 13896). This bill will now be sent to the President.
27. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Passed, by a vote of 249 to 158, without amendment, H. R. 11001, to provide for the participation of the U. S. in the International Development Association. pp. 13896-7
28. PERSONNEL. Passed with amendments H. R. 12383, to amend the Federal Employees Compensation Act to make the benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates. pp. 13921-5
29. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Passed, by a vote of 395 to 1, with amendment, H. R. 7903, to extend for 2 years the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program. pp. 13925-32
Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 5040, to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (p. 13938). This bill will now be sent to the President.
30. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. House conferees were appointed on amendments in disagreement on this bill, H. R. 12232 (pp. 13938-9). Senate conferees have been appointed.
31. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 68, to provide for the continued delivery of water under the Federal reclamation laws to lands held by husband and wife upon the death of either. p. D636
32. TRANSPORTATION. Disagreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 11135, to aid in the development of a unified and integrated system of transportation for the National Capital Region, and conferees were appointed (p. 13940). Senate conferees have been appointed.
33. PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1319, to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 so as to eliminate the requirement that property conveyed for historic-monument purposes under such section must have been acquired by the U. S. on or before Jan. 1, 1900 (H. Rept. 2032). p. 13969
34. LANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9732, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property in Calif. to Trinity County (H. Rept. 2035). p. 13969
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 10102, to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit. p. D636
35. EDUCATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10876, to amend the law relating to the support and endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts to increase the authorized appropriations for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. p. 13969

36. FLOOD CONTROL. Conferees agreed to file a conference report on H. R. 7634, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, for navigation and flood control. p. D637
37. POSTAL RATES. Rep. Porter criticized Postmaster General Summerfield for "gross and intentional misrepresentations of the postal rate and deficit picture." pp. 13953-4
38. IMPORTS. Passed as reported H. R. 11573, to provide for the duty-free importation of two electron microscopes for education or research purposes. pp. 13948-9
- Passed without amendment H. R. 9240, to authorize the informal entries of merchandise where the aggregate value of the shipment does not exceed \$400. pp. 13947-8
39. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the legislative program for today, June 30, will include the following: Private Calendar; conference reports on defense and general Government matters appropriation bills; minimum-wage increase bill, and Sugar Act extension bill. pp. D635-6

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

40. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Speech in the House by Rep. McDowell during debate on the proposed bill to provide participation of the United States in the International Development Association. pp. A5637-8
41. FOOD FOR PEACE. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley inserting an article "reflecting the splendid way in which various programs have served to fulfill not only humanitarian needs but also to make friends for the United States." pp. A5642-3
42. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Hruska inserted an article, "Farmers Ride Gravy Train -- But Everybody Else Gets the Gravy." pp. A5645-7

BILLS INTRODUCED

43. WHEAT. H. R. 12870, by Rep. Albert, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to market-adjustment and price-support programs for wheat; to Agriculture Committee.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

44. APPROPRIATIONS. H. R. 12117, Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill for 1961. Approved June 29, 1960 (Public Law 86-532, 86th Congress).
- H. J. Res. 765, to provide supplemental appropriations to the Department of Labor for unemployment compensation for veterans and Federal employees. Approved June 29, 1960. (Public Law 86-535, 86th Congress).
45. REPORTS. S. 899, to provide for the discontinuance of certain reports now required by law (including certain reports relating to foot-and-mouth disease, experiment stations, and extension work of this Department). Approved June 29, 1960 (Public Law 86-533, 86th Congress).

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10876

JUNE 29, 1960.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 586]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 586, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 268

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 586

[Report No. 2036]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 29, 1960

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
4 for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10876) to amend
5 section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of
6 colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act
7 of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation
8 for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions. After
9 general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall
10 continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and
11 controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member

1 of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for
2 amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion
3 of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Com-
4 mittee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such
5 amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous
6 question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amend-
7 ments thereto to final passage without intervening motion
8 except one motion to recommit.

86TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. RES. 586

[Report No. 2036]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H.R. 10876, a bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions.

By Mr. O'NEILL

JUNE 29, 1960

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued July 5, 1960
For actions of July 2, 1960
86th-2d, No. 124

Acreage allotments.....	19
Appropriations.....	1,30,40
ARS.....	1
Budget.....	33
Coconut meat.....	7
Conservation.....	16
Cotton.....	21,34
Economics.....	31
Education.....	4,5
Electrification.....	13
Entomology.....	1
Expenditures.....	31
FAO.....	23
Farm loans.....	14
Farm program.....	8
FHA.....	4
Flood control.....	1
Food reserve.....	38
Foreign affairs.....	24
Foreign trade.....	22
Forest highways.....	1,3
General Counsel.....	10
Great Plains.....	19
Labor standards.....	37
Land-grant colleges.....	5
Lands.....	6,27
Margarine.....	17
Minimum wage.....	30
Nomination.....	10
Organization.....	26
Pay increase.....	1,12
Personnel.....	12,25,35
Population.....	23
Postal service.....	4,29
Poultry food.....	1
Procurement.....	15
Public Law 480.....	24
Roads and trails.....	3
Soft woods.....	7
Sugar.....	2,11,32
Supplemental appropriation.....	1
Surplus commodities.....	13,24
Tariffs.....	36
Watersheds.....	1
Weather.....	28
Wheat.....	9
Wilderness.....	39
Wildlife.....	20

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed and House rejected measure to permit President to adjust Cuban sugar quota. Sen. Johnson proposed new farm program. Sen. Carlson urged study of wheat. Both Houses received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses agreed to conference report on road authorization bill, including forest roads. Senate confirmed nomination of Stephens to be USDA General Counsel. Sen. Murray introduced and discussed bill to establish National Wilderness Preservation System. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to establish national security food and fiber reserve.

*HOUSE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Both Houses considered Senate amendments to this bill, H. R. 12740 (pp. 14603, 14616-31, 14651, 14586). By a vote of 257 to 109, the House agreed to a Rules Committee resolution providing for consideration of the bill with Senate amendments (pp. 14616-27). The House concurred in Senate amendments to provide to SCS \$1,800,000 additional for watershed protection and \$1,570,000 additional for flood prevention activities (p. 14628). The House receded from its disagreement to, and concurred in, Senate amendments to strike out \$500,000 to ARS for the construction of an entomology laboratory and insert \$5,200,000 to ARS for the construction of facilities, and to provide \$1,350,000 addition to AMS to permit inspection of poultry.

food products in processing plants during fiscal year 1961 (p. 14651). The House agreed to insist on its disagreement to a Senate amendment to provide \$30,000,000 to the Bureau of Public Roads for payment of obligations incurred in the construction of forest highways, and a Senate amendment to provide that appropriations, authorizations, and funds available to departments and agencies for the fiscal year 1961 may be apportioned on the basis indicating the need for supplemental estimates so as to permit the payment of pay increases provided for in new pay raise law (p. 14651).

2. SUGAR. Agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 598) providing for the return to the Senate without action S. J. Res. 217, to permit the President to adjust Cuban sugar quotas for the balance of the calendar year 1960. Rep. McCormack stated that the resolution "states that the House respectfully declines to receive it on the ground that it involves revenue or affects revenue; and, under the Constitution, such legislation should originate in the House of Representatives." p. 14657
3. ROADS; FORESTRY. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10495, the highway authorization bill. As agreed to the bill authorizes \$33,000,000 for forest highways for each of the fiscal years 1962 and 1963, and \$35,000,000 and \$40,000,000 for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963, respectively, for forest development roads and trails, and authorizes \$500,000 for the construction of a road on forest land in Ga. (pp. 14546-9, 14602-3). This bill will now be sent to the President.
4. POSTAL RATES; EDUCATION. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 4595, to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials (pp. 14599-600). This bill will now be sent to the President.
5. LAND-GRANT COLLEGES; EDUCATION. Passed without amendment S. 3450, to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, so as to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. The bill increases the amount to be equally distributed to States from \$1 million each fiscal year to \$7,650,000, and increases the amount to be distributed annually on the basis of relative population from \$1,501,500 each fiscal year to \$4,300,000. (pp. 14606-12) This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H. R. 10876 was tabled.
6. LANDS. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. R. 7004, to permit consistent practices in the management of all Bureau of Land Management lands so far as investigations, cooperative agreements, and acceptance of contributions are concerned (p. 14631). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. COCONUT MEAT; SOFT WOODS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 11748, relating to the suspension of duty on metal scrap, including provisions to fix the import duty at 1-1/10 cents per pound on fresh coconut meat which has not been desiccated, and provides for the duty-free importation of tight barrelheads of soft wood (pp. 14604-5). This bill will now be sent to the President.

*(This is a partial report; the balance of the proceedings for July 2 have not yet been printed.)

claimed by the President. In order to make certain that this oil import program will not be affected by this amendment, the conferees agreed to language in the conference report specifically stating that this shall be the case.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. On the first amendment with reference to coconut meat, what does that come in competition with here?

Mr. MILLS. It is imported under the provision of the Tariff Act assessing a rate of duty of 20 percent ad valorem under paragraph 758(b) for application to subject matters not specifically covered in the Tariff Act otherwise. That is, it is a general catch-all provision.

What we are doing now is writing a specific rate of duty applicable to coconut meat that has not been desiccated. Therefore, from the gentleman's point of view this is not an inducement to greater imports; this is actually a clarification to establish a specific rate of duty with respect to a specific article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But the specific question I asked the gentleman was, What does coconut meat come in competition with here in this country?

Mr. MILLS. I am not certain that there is anything that coconut meat comes in competition with in the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then it is purely a revenue provision.

Mr. MILLS. It was introduced in the Tax Committee of the Senate.

(Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the House-passed version of this legislation has as its purpose the restoration for a period of 1 year through June 30, 1961, of the suspension of duties on metal scrap which expired on June 30, 1960.

This legislation passed the House on May 19, 1960. The Senate in acting on H.R. 11748 approved three substantive amendments to the bill.

The first of these amendments would provide a separate tariff classification and a tariff rate of 1½ cents per pound for certain coconut meat. Favorable executive department reports on this amendment were received from the Departments of Agriculture, State, and Treasury. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment.

The second Senate amendment would permit the duty-free importation of tight barrelheads of softwood. The Senate Committee on Finance in approving this amendment received favorable reports from the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, and State, an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission, and a noncommittal report from the Department of Labor. The House conferees accepted this Senate amendment.

The third Senate-approved amendment to H.R. 11748 would provide that vessels and air carriers operating between the

States of Alaska and Hawaii and any other part of the United States may be able to obtain certain supplies for use on such vessels or aircraft free of customs duty and excise tax. My distinguished committee colleagues, the Honorable CECIL R. KING, and the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, joined in cosponsoring legislation having a similar purpose, H.R. 9685 and H.R. 9920 respectively. In addition to the substance of the provisions of these House bills the Senate in approving this third amendment also approved as a part of its third amendment a provision pertaining to the status of petroleum products under this amendment. Under this petroleum provision it is provided that the free withdrawal privilege shall not be available to petroleum products for voyages or flights exclusively between Hawaii or Alaska and any airport or Pacific Coast seaport of the United States.

This reference in the Senate amendment to petroleum products raised the question of whether or not the amendment of section 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 would affect the oil import quota program proclaimed by the President under the national security provision of the trade agreements legislation. There was some thought that this amendment would have the effect of excluding from the oil import quota program oil used on vessels and aircraft of the United States Government. It was the conclusion of the House-Senate conferees that this matter could best be dealt with, if necessary, by modifying the proclamation dealing with the subject of oil import quotas. In addition, the conferees received assurance from spokesmen for the Defense Department that there was no intention on the part of that Department to circumvent the oil import program in connection with the operation of United States Government vessels and aircraft between the mainland of the United States and the States of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished committee chairman in urging my House colleagues to approve this conference agreement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the bill (H.R. 12699) to cancel a deed of trust to the United States from the predecessor in name of Gallaudet College and any evidences of indebtedness related to the same transaction, to quiet the college's title to property belonging to it, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) as used in this Act, the term "Institution" means the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb (also known as Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb and, later, as the Columbia Institution for the Deaf), which was continued as a body corporate under the name of Gallaudet College by the Act approved June 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 265, Public Law 420, 83d Cong. ch. 324).

(b) All property conveyed by the Institution to the United States, as trustee, pursuant to certain provisos under the heading "Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb" in the Act of June 10, 1872, Forty-second Congress, second session (17 Stat. L. 347, at 360), by deed dated June 20, 1872, and recorded in liber 752, folio 272, of the land records for the District of Columbia, and all property otherwise made subject to such deed of trust, is hereby given, granted, remised, released, and quitclaimed unto Gallaudet College, free and clear of any trust, lien, encumbrance, or indebtedness arising out of said deed or under the said Act of June 10, 1872, and the college is forever discharged from the obligation of repayment, to the United States, of the sum referred to in said Act and in said deed, or in any note or other evidence of indebtedness executed in connection therewith.

SEC. 2. The said deed, and any note or other evidence of indebtedness executed in connection therewith, and all original papers with respect thereto, shall be delivered by the Administrator of General Services (or any other officer of the United States having custody thereof) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (or his designee) and shall by the Secretary (or his designee) be canceled and returned to Gallaudet College for its historical records.

SEC. 3. Section 9(a) of the said Act of June 18, 1954 (repealing various statutes), is amended by inserting, immediately after the second paragraph following the first colon, the following new paragraph:

"The first and second provisos at the end of the third paragraph under the heading 'Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb' in the Act approved June 10, 1872, chapter 415, volume 17, Statutes at Large, page 347, which appear at page 360 and read as follows: 'Provided, That before the expenditure of any part of this appropriation, by proper deeds of conveyance, to be approved by the Attorney General of the United States, all the real estate now owned by the said Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb shall be vested in the United States, as trustee, for the sole use and purpose provided in the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind," approved February 16, 1857, and the several Acts amendatory thereof: *Provided, That, whenever Congress shall so determine, any part of said estate may be sold, and so much of the proceeds thereof as shall be needful for the purpose shall be applied to reimburse the United States for the expenditure herein provided.*'"

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the said Act of June 18, 1954, is amended by inserting at the beginning of such subsection, immediately before "Gallaudet College", the following: "Subject to the provisions of subsection (b)."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 3 of the Act of June 18, 1954, is amended by inserting "real" immediately before "property" and by striking out "the United States, as trustee, for the sole use of".

SEC. 5. All Acts in conflict with this Act are repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR LAND-GRANT COLLEGE INSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 586) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10876 to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the resolution makes clear the purpose of the bill made in order by the resolution. It is an open rule. I know of no controversy on the rule.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the rule, and I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10876) to amend section 22—relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts—of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10876) with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr.

HOEVEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes before the Committee with the unanimous support of the House Committee on Agriculture, which committee considered this matter very carefully. It comes before the committee with the support of the land-grant colleges of America. The fact is, I do not know of anyone who is opposed to the bill, so I shall not trespass very long upon your patience, however, I would like to make a brief statement with reference to the bill before us.

HISTORY OF THE LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The national system of land-grant colleges and universities was established by the passage of the first Morrill Act in 1862. Under this act each State was offered grants of Federal land proportionate to its membership in Congress, the land to be sold and the proceeds invested as a permanent endowment fund with the income going for the support of teaching in at least one college in each State. The use of this money for the construction, maintenance or repair of buildings was prohibited. This college was to emphasize "agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto" and to include military tactics in its course offerings. The act provided that "other scientific and classical subjects should not be excluded" and said that the great objective was the "liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

It was apparently the intention of the Congress at the time of the passage of the first Morrill Act that the income from the national endowment would fully support instruction in these colleges. The States were required to furnish the buildings and equipment, or see that they were furnished. Control over the methods of instruction, and so forth, was reserved entirely to the States.

As time passed it became clear that the income from the land endowment would not support the instructional program of the colleges if they were to meet the needs of the young people of their States and of the Nation. Thus State support for instruction, as well as for buildings and equipment, became an increasingly important factor.

In 1890 the Congress recognized that Federal instructional support from the land-endowment investment was far short of what had been contemplated, and passed the second Morrill Act, providing direct annual grants to the colleges for instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, and subjects related thereto. This act was passed unanimously in both Houses of Congress. In 1907 it was amended and increased, and constitutes a permanent appropriation act in the amount of \$2,550,000, representing \$50,000 to each State and Puerto Rico for use in supporting instruction in the land-grant institutions of those States.

In 1935, the Congress included in the Bankhead-Jones Act, as authored by this committee, a provision which grant-

ed an additional \$20,000 to each State for teaching purposes in its land-grant institutions, and an additional amount which is distributed to each State on the basis of population. The total of funds authorized under this title of the Bankhead-Jones Act is now \$2,501,500, of which \$1 million is distributed on the basis of \$20,000 to each of the 50 States; and the remainder on a population basis. Puerto Rico is not included in this act, but would be included as the act is amended by this bill.

The enrollment since 1935 has increased by 340 percent in the land-grant colleges; the increase in the graduate enrollment has been 500 percent. The institutions are now receiving only a small part of their annual budget from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is meritorious legislation, it should be enacted. The Senate has already passed an identical bill, S. 3451. Upon adoption of the House bill I will move to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill so that we can send it on to the White House.

I conclude by saying that the money made available by this bill will be available only for the payment of the salaries of the members of the faculties of these colleges and in keeping with the intent and purpose of the acts of Congress which I have heretofore referred to.

I do not know of any opposition, but I do know that the bill is important, and should be enacted in the present session. If there are any questions, a member of the committee or I will be able to answer such questions as may be propounded.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. In examining the report I cannot see that there is any mention as to how much this bill is going to cost. The report shows how much money was allocated in 1959.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, and I can answer it. Unfortunately, we did not include that in the committee report, but it is in the transcript of the hearings, page 15.

Under the original Morrill Act as amended there are \$2,550,000 made available; from the Bankhead-Jones Act, the present appropriation is \$2,501,500.

The total increase would be \$9,448,500, or a grand total of \$14,500,000. That is on page 15 of the hearings.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I notice on page 9 of the committee report a statement by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare saying that:

Any Federal aid to higher education should be pinpointed toward high priority needs and should be made available to any qualified institution of higher education able and willing to do its part in meeting these needs. This basic principle underlies the National Defense Education Act and all legislative proposals which this administra-

tion has made or endorsed in aid of higher education, including its pending proposal for Federal assistance in the construction of housing and academic facilities (H.R. 4267 and H.R. 4415).

For these reasons we are unable to recommend enactment of H.R. 10876.

Now, I would like to have the comments of the gentleman on that statement.

Mr. COOLEY. We are dealing not with all of the institutions of higher learning; we are dealing with land-grant colleges provided for in this country about 99 years ago. They have been of great value to all of the people of the Nation, and they are still rendering a magnificent service. They are serving some of the highest priority needs in education-science and engineering.

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities constitute fewer than 5 percent of all the institutions of higher education of all kinds in the United States, and they enroll more than 21 percent of all the students in 4-year colleges and universities. But their significance is out of all proportion to their enrollment. They train 100 percent of all those who receive doctor's degrees in agriculture and more than 80 percent of all those getting bachelor's degrees.

In the basic biological sciences, they grant 56 percent of all doctor's degrees—the level of training required for research, and over 50 percent at the master's degree level, required for secondary teaching in this important field. Ninety-five percent of all entomologists in this country, the men and women who deal with our insect pests, get their first degrees at land-grant institutions, as do 55 percent of all people who start out in bacteriology and its related fields so essential in both agriculture and in the health sciences. About 37 percent of all students who later go into medicine, veterinary medicine, and dentistry get their first degrees at land-grant institutions. At the doctor's degree level of professional training these institutions graduate 93 percent of all so trained in the United States.

Thirty percent of all those who get master's degrees in mathematics in the United States—the level required for secondary school teaching—get these degrees at land-grant institutions; while at the doctoral level required for high-level research and college teaching the figure is more than 39 percent. In the related field of statistics, the land-grant institutions grant 48 percent of all first degrees and nearly 60 percent of all doctoral degrees.

In engineering, 41 percent of all engineers receiving their first degrees in the United States come from land-grant institutions; while at the doctor's degree level the figure is nearly 53 percent. And 72 percent of all the forestry students in the country get their degrees in the land-grant group.

In the basic physical sciences: The land-grant institutions give 42 percent of all doctoral degrees in all fields, including 36 percent of all physicists, 40 percent of all chemists, and 73 percent of all geologists.

Merely because Mr. Flemming wants to go far beyond the scope of this bill

is no reason for us to defeat this measure, pending the date when Congress will accept his recommendation.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. That provision for land-grant colleges was nearly 100 years ago. Do you not think it is fair in this day and age, right now, that the money should go to educational needs on the basis recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Mr. COOLEY. If we should divide this small Federal contribution among all the institutions of higher learning, it would be so negligible that it would not amount to anything at all. Now, I do not think we ought to permit Mr. Flemming to advance his ideas here and defeat the purpose of Congress established 99 years ago and again reestablished in 1909 and again in 1935.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. How many States have land-grant colleges?

Mr. COOLEY. I think every State in the Union now has a land-grant college, and if this bill is passed, we will make funds available to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I am going to support this measure, but I would like to ask the gentleman a few questions. What is the total amount of the increase in the appropriation to the land-grant colleges throughout the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. \$9,448,500. That is found on the bottom of page 15 of the transcript.

Mr. SANTANGELO. So that this is an additional \$9 million for the payment of teachers' salaries in land-grant colleges or agricultural colleges; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I trust that when the bill for Federal aid to education comes up we can get some sympathetic consideration from the gentleman that we are going to give him on this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation provides for an increased authorization for the amount of money which can be appropriated by the Congress each year for resident teaching grants for land-grant colleges. The bill does not appropriate any money itself. It simply raises from \$5 million per year to \$14½ million the amount that can be appropriated.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON], ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Research and Extension, will give you the details.

This \$9½ million increase in the authorization is justified, in view of the tremendous contribution that the land-grant colleges make to agriculture, national defense, and to higher learning in general. These fine institutions, like the great Iowa State University at Ames, Iowa, have helped make America the greatest breadbasket in the history of all

mankind. They have provided thousands of junior officers for our armed services and they have educated millions of our citizens.

Nearly 100 years ago the Federal Government inaugurated the land-grant college program. The Morrill Act was signed by President Lincoln on July 2, 1862. It offered to endow at least one college in each State, in order to serve the interests of the people of that State. Through the years the basic act has been amended, but the basic purposes of agriculture and military science have been preserved. The last major amendment regarding Federal contribution to resident teaching grants was in 1935 under the Bankhead-Jones Act. This bill will bring up to date that formula put into effect some 25 years ago. The increased authorization is a reflection of both increased student populations and the decreased value of the dollar. It has the support of farm organizations, educators, and our Committee on Agriculture. It is a sound and justifiable bill which should be enacted.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

I do not know of any institutions in our country which have made greater contributions to the economic and social development of our Nation, as well as to the defense of the country through the ROTC programs, than the land-grant colleges. One of these fine institutions—Mississippi State University—is located in the district I am honored to represent.

Personally, I think this legislation is long overdue. I was very happy to join with my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture in reporting the bill and I commend it to the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to join the chairman of our committee and our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], and others, in full support of this legislation. Those of us who have had the privilege of attending land-grant institutions, particularly in the field of agriculture, can understand the importance that these institutions have had in the field of agriculture as well as in other fields.

I certainly feel that every State in the Union has had, through this system of land-grant colleges, one of the finest programs of higher education for the young people of all economic levels.

I certainly join in support of this legislation.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend the Committee on Agriculture on both sides of the aisle for reporting out this excellent piece of legislation which I think will strengthen the excellent program inaugurated close to a century ago under the Morrill Act.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that education is the foremost of our national priorities.

Here we have a program that is far from new. The century-old land grant aid program is firmly rooted in history and has been an unqualified success. The bill before us, H.R. 10876, does nothing to create new directions or to radically alter this program. It merely gives it a badly needed shoring up.

Because of inflation and the stabilization of funds for land-grant colleges, the Federal Government is not participating nearly so fully as it was a quarter century ago. There are few who would deny that this is not wise in a day when education is such a critical national and global problem. The bill before us does not even restore Federal participation to its level of 25 years ago on a percentage basis. It merely steps up participation to a figure closer to the 1935 level; this, while a small step, is indisputably one in the right direction.

To illustrate how dramatically Federal participation has fallen off in the past quarter century, I need only look at the figures for West Virginia.

In 1935, State tax funds appropriated to land-grant institutions totaled \$1,262,000, while the Federal Government contributed \$70,000. This represented 5.25 percent of the total.

In 1959-60, State funds for these same institutions amounted to \$10,600,000. But the Federal contribution amounted to only \$90,000—less than 1 percent of the total operating budget.

Thus, while State funds increased about 900 percent, Federal funds increased only about 28 percent. This is woefully inadequate.

Even under H.R. 10876, Federal participation still would not approach 5.25 percent in West Virginia. It would rise only about 2 percent. And this increase of about \$250,000 would be more than matched by a State contribution already on schedule for 1960-61, appropriating \$1,250,000 more in State funds.

As I say, this is only a small step forward—but it is one that the Congress certainly ought to take.

The president of West Virginia University, Elvis Stahr, made a special trip to testify in a dramatic and convincing way of the need for this legislation. President Stahr forcefully demonstrated the progress achieved under the meager authorization which has been held down to the same level since 1935. He conclusively indicated the great advantages which would accrue to our entire Nation through the expansion of this program.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who inquire whether the taxpayers will suffer from an increased financial burden. I say it is about time we ask: Can the country afford not to invest in a pro-

gram which will help both the individual taxpayer and the security of the Nation?

I strongly support and urge the overwhelming adoption of H.R. 10876.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dixon].

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a thoroughly good measure and a much-needed measure. I wish every Member of this fine body could have heard the pleas that were presented for it. If they had, there would be no hesitancy in passing it, as there was no hesitancy on the part of the great Committee on Agriculture which passed it with only two dissenting votes.

In answer to one question that was just raised I will say that there are 68 land-grant colleges and universities in the United States.

Every State has a land-grant college. Without this bill, too, for the information of the Members of the House, Puerto Rico would have no participation in the land-grant college program. We want Puerto Rico to have the same opportunity as all of our States have.

Our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] has explained his bill. I introduced a bill that is identical with the chairman's bill.

The original Morrill Act passed in 1862 conceived the idea that proceeds from the land grants would take care of the salaries of the instructors in the land-grant colleges, but this has fallen far short. We know, because the act had to be amended in 1907 to give \$50,000 more to each State to take care of the salaries. The last time it was amended was in 1935. Since that time we have had an inflation of 100 percent, and since that time, 1935, the population has increased 40 percent. The total enrollment in land-grant colleges has increased 340 percent, and the graduate enrollment, which is the most expensive division of the land-grant colleges, has increased 500 percent. The enrollment in the land-grant colleges will double by 1970, so you can get some idea of the basis of the need.

Further, in 1953 40.5 percent of the staffs of the colleges and universities in the United States had doctor's degrees. Of all the new teachers hired in 1953 and 1954, only 31.4 percent had doctor's degrees. The trend has been gradually down. In 1958 and 1959 only 23.8 percent of all new teachers in our colleges and universities had doctor's degrees. So you can see the rapid way in which the scholastic standards of the staffs of our colleges and universities are deteriorating.

All we have done in arriving at this figure of \$9 million-plus increase is to take into consideration the 100 percent inflation factor and the 40 percent increase in population factor. This request is modest. Based upon increased enrollment, a \$30 million increase would be justifiable.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. How much is this going to cost the taxpayers of our land?

Mr. DIXON. Does the gentleman mean the increase or the total appropriation?

Mr. JENSEN. The total appropriation.

Mr. DIXON. The total appropriation is \$14,500,000. The increase requested is \$9,440,000.

Mr. JENSEN. What is the gentleman's reason for being in favor of this bill? Why cannot Puerto Rico stand on their own feet? We have given them everything with a ring around it. Now we are helping in this respect with our tax dollars.

Mr. DIXON. I cannot conceive of the gentleman from Iowa, which has one of the finest land-grant colleges in the world and which has benefited humanity throughout the world, questioning why Puerto Rico should not have a little of the same enlightenment.

Mr. JENSEN. It would be all right if they paid for it. We are paying for the school in Iowa. Why does not Puerto Rico pay for their own colleges and schools? They are financially better able to take care of their educational problems than is the United States.

Mr. DIXON. Puerto Rico will probably have to pay the largest proportion, as the States are paying, for the program.

I would like to say for the gentleman's information that in 1935 to 1937 the Federal Government paid 22 percent of Alabama's cost of land-grant colleges.

Mr. JENSEN. Alabama is in the mainland of the United States.

Mr. DIXON. Yes, but Puerto Rico will have to carry most of the load. The Federal Government pays only 2.1 to 4 percent in most States. Arkansas did have 30 percent of her salaries from the Federal Government. Now it is only 1.45 percent. Colorado did have 23.37 percent paid by the Federal Government. Now it is only 2.55 percent. Even if this bill is passed, Arkansas would have only 4 percent of her salaries paid. You can go on down the list of States and see how the Federal Government has pushed nearly the entire burden of these salaries, onto the States.

Mr. JENSEN. That is quite beside the point.

Mr. DIXON. No. I think it is right on the point.

Mr. JENSEN. Puerto Rico is well able to take care of their own educational problems.

Mr. DIXON. The biggest proportion of their expense will be paid by them. The Federal Government will give them only a very small fraction.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Puerto Rico has a magnificent university which it has developed. That is no excuse. Neither are two of our recent States on the mainland. Speaking of sending American dollars to Puerto Rico, the people of Puerto Rico are American citizens.

Mr. DIXON. The people are American citizens, and I think they should have the same right as every other

American citizen. Also, Puerto Rico will stand practically all of these expenses in any event. Funds from this bill do not amount to a drop in the bucket. All the bill does is to place land grant colleges on the same status as they were in 1935. All this increase does is to provide 100 percent for inflation and 40 percent for the increase in the population of the United States. It provides nothing for the 340 percent increased student population. It provides nothing for the 500 percent increase in graduate students which is so expensive.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am in favor of this bill, but what is the gentleman's reaction to the position of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the ground that it does not go far enough as far as teaching in higher education is concerned?

Mr. DIXON. I think basically the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not favor Federal aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Dixon] has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes. That is one thing, the matter of policy.

The second thing about their position is the inference that this is a new Federal aid bill being passed. We had the second Morrill Act before the turn of the century, and the first Morrill Act was in 1862. So this statute has been on the books all the time. It is not a new Federal aid bill at all.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. The sum of money recommended here is an annual appropriation. We could never cut it back.

Mr. DIXON. If the gentleman will recall, we are appropriating under these acts now.

Mr. FOGARTY. The additional amount in this bill is \$9 million.

I want to associate myself with the gentleman on that. I am for this bill. I think it should be enacted. I have never been ashamed to say that it is a federally aided program. It is a Federal aid program for education.

Mr. DIXON. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, because I have been an administrator of a great agricultural college, the Utah State University, and I have seen our good people taken away time after time, people who were in key positions, taken away by industry to do research at double the salary we were able to pay them.

If ever there was need, that need is right here. Furthermore the enrollment of these colleges is going to be doubled within the next 10 years. We just do not conceive what is ahead of these institutions by way of problems.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. KYL. The language on page 9 to which the previous gentleman referred is subject to misinterpretation. In

this act we are dealing with Government aided institutions, State universities, and so on.

Mr. DIXON. Yes, operating under laws that are already established.

Mr. KYL. And the other aid to which the Secretary refers, the National Defense Education Act, is largely a different subject, for under that act the aid instead of being given directly to the universities was given to the student to enable him to attend the university, and the university was then paid proportionately. There is a difference which should be brought out.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. How much money is it going to take to support this legislation in fiscal 1961?

Mr. DIXON. In 1961 it will take \$14,500,000. They are already spending \$5,051,000. It will take \$9,440,000 some-odd more than they are spending this year.

Mr. JENSEN. The Appropriations Committees of Congress will be asked to supply these millions. So the members of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am one, will have an opportunity to reduce this amount, or to give them nothing in addition to the amount they now receive under present law. Is my assumption correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. The fact is, in further reply to the gentleman from Iowa who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, that the committee would appropriate only such items as are definitely justified under the authorization legislation. There is nothing to be concerned about; it is simply an authorization, and the Appropriations Committee has to determine what sum of money will be appropriated under proper justification. Is not that correct?

Mr. DIXON. That is my understanding.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Subject to the approval of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

Mr. DIXON. The purpose for which this money is spent has been questioned.

What are these funds used for? Russell I. Thackery, executive secretary of the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, provided me with a complete breakdown which can be found in the form of a table on page 70 of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, May 16 and 24, 1960. Of course these funds are for salaries exclusively, and I quote from the Morrill Act, "for instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, the English language, and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic sciences with special reference to their applications in the industries of life, and to the facilities for such instruction."

The land-grant colleges are very carefully audited to see that none of these funds are used for buildings, sites, land, administrative, clerical or nonteaching staff. Mr. Thackery says the funds may not be used for "salaries of instructors in philosophy, psychology, ethics, logic, history, civil government and ancient and modern languages."

The U.S. Office of Education limits them to:

First. Instruction in agriculture.

Second. Instruction in mechanic arts—various fields and subjects include the major branches of engineering.

Third. Instruction in English language.

Fourth. Instruction in natural and physical sciences.

Fifth. Instruction in economic sciences—including political economy and home economics.

Sixth. Special preparation of teachers—specific vocational courses are included, but general courses are excluded.

The table found in the hearings on page 70 shows a total of \$5,051,622.73 spent in 1959, itemized as follows: Salaries, \$4,919,805.82; facilities, \$131,816.91; agriculture, \$792,445.73; mechanic arts, \$1,415,823.04; English language, \$656,806.11; mathematical science, \$446,076.24; natural and physical science, \$1,342,139.65; economic science, \$370,883.59; special preparation of teachers, \$27,448.37.

How does the Federal support for salary purposes compare with the State support over the years?

In every case, even with the enactment of H.R. 10876, the percentage of Federal support will be substantially less than it was in 1937. I shall cite only a few cases:

State	1937-38	1957-58	Under H.R. 10876 and H.R. 10974 (using 1957-58 expenditures as the base)
Alabama.....	22.82	2.19	6.24
Arkansas.....	30.40	1.45	4.13
Colorado.....	23.37	2.55	7.27
Connecticut.....	23.98	1.69	4.82
Delaware.....	33.84	3.68	10.52
Idaho.....	17.16	3.22	9.19
Maine.....	16.65	3.16	9.03
Mississippi.....	31.08	3.22	9.17
Montana.....	40.02	3.10	8.85
Nevada.....	40.95	4.38	12.50
New Mexico.....	50.90	4.70	13.42
North Dakota.....	38.32	4.30	12.27
Rhode Island.....	39.21	3.87	11.00
South Carolina.....	27.99	3.48	9.93
South Dakota.....	28.18	3.38	9.65
Utah.....	22.58	2.97	8.50

The House Agriculture Committee passed this bill with only two dissenting votes and the Senate passed it without a dissenting vote. I therefore urge the full support of the House for this splendid measure.

The year 1962 will mark the 100th anniversary of the founding of the land-grant colleges. In the year after next—1962—we should have a great national centennial celebration. It was in the darkest days of the Civil War that our great President, Abraham Lincoln, signed the Morrill Act for the cultural and prac-

tical education of the common man. This initiated a revolutionary change in the philosophy of education and was in sharp contradiction to the concept of higher education only for the elite which had dominated world thinking up to Lincoln's time. The land-grant colleges go into all of the homes that do all of the work in every American community and help these people to do that work better and to live more happily.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

(Mr. PIRNIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, consideration of this legislation by our committee provided an opportunity to review some of the accomplishments attributable to the Morrill Act through its development of the land grant institutions. We have found these achievements to be outstanding and to have contributed a great deal to our national strength. Subsequently, I thought it might be helpful if I attempted to review what had occurred in the leading land-grant university in our area, Cornell University, in the State of New York, since 1935 when we last fixed the appropriations for this purpose.

We find that in 1935 the operating expenses of the University were \$7 million, while today it is \$52 million. Its faculty then consisted of 441 members, while now there are 1,100. In the College of Agriculture, one of the main objectives under the Act, we find that the students have increased in enrollment from 1,494 in 1935 to 2,392. In the entire university it has approximately doubled, from 5,910 to 11,191.

It might be of interest to this body to know what impact the university has on foreign countries. There are at the present time 753 foreign students from 78 countries, many of them coming from the Far East. Latin America has 86, the Near East 54, and Africa 39 of these foreign students. Of these foreign students the College of Agriculture enrolls 36 percent, or 271.

I think it is very significant that we are able in this way to provide the kind of education which can lift the economic well-being of the underdeveloped countries.

There is another factor which I would like to mention to the House, and that is the impact of the military training which has been provided by our land-grant institutions. If you will refer to the committee report you will find a paragraph on that subject. It states that between World War I and World War II annually from 50 to 70 percent of all the young men receiving commissions did so through the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in these same institutions. General Marshall paid tribute to this source of commissioned strength, and our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, while Chief of Staff, made a similar observation.

We now find that approximately one-third of all of our commissioned strength is now supplied by the land-grant institutions, that is, exclusive of those

coming from the service Academies. It would seem that the original purpose of the Morrill Act, which was enacted, as has been stated, approximately 100 years ago, is being fulfilled by these institutions which are a credit to their States and to this Nation.

We find that the amount of increased aid will be distributed in direct proportion to the formula which we have heretofore approved. The total is clearly needed in the light of new conditions.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this House will continue its enthusiastic support of this fine program.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman made reference to the increased enrollment of students in the land-grant colleges and the increased contributions being made by the States. Reference was heretofore made to the Iowa University at Ames, Iowa. I want to call the Committee's attention to the fact that in 1935 the State of Iowa contributed to Iowa State College, which is now a State university, \$2,175,000, at which time we had 4,412 students. This year the State of Iowa is contributing \$11,500,000 for 9,252 students. In other words, our student population has doubled since 1935 at Iowa State and the State support has increased almost sixfold. I simply want to point out that even though the student population is increasing, the State of Iowa is certainly rising to its responsibility in providing the necessary appropriations.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee. The record of his State is highly commendable. I am glad to say it has its counterparts elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the chairman of our committee and to all the members of this committee who have attacked this problem so seriously, appreciating that education in the field of agriculture is a great source of economic strength to the Nation and that these land-grant colleges are effectively serving the very commendable purpose of this founding.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. In my district is a great A. & M. school, now changed to a State university, at Fort Collins. This legislation is carrying forward one of the great historic acts of this Congress.

About 100 years ago the Congress passed the first Morrill Act. At that time four out of every five persons living in the United States were living in rural areas, on the farm, to maintain the fifth person in the city. Some years ago a great farm leader asked the question "Why are farmers elsewhere in the world usually peasants, while our farmers are successful businessmen?" And, he attributed the answer to the great contribution of our A. & M. schools which were built as a result of the first and second Morrill Acts, and subsequent

State legislation. Now, in the 100 years since this act was passed, we have increased the U.S. population sixfold. Now we have one person living on the farm for eight persons in the cities; that is to say that the farm family is serving eight nonfarm families. As the result of this program, we have brought the industrial revolution to agriculture right along with the industrial revolution in the cities. The American people are prosperous; they enjoy this rich development because Congress has had the foresight and the wisdom to endow and to support colleges which would see to it that the techniques of science and technology would immediately be made available on the farm.

A successful American farmer these days, has \$50,000 or \$100,000 invested. I think everyone knows down in his heart that the American farmer, is a success, not just because of his intrinsic merit or because he is an American, but because the Federal Government and the several State Governments have invested in colleges and universities and experiment stations to help in carrying forward the progress of agricultural science and the mechanic arts. These programs have served not only the American farmers, but, in the years that lie ahead, as we have just been told, will help to bring the same agricultural-industrial revolution to other parts of the world, so that men everywhere may not just walk behind the plow or carry the hoe, but may live in freedom, may live in something better than ignorance, and misery, and squalor. So I think it is entirely proper on this occasion that we should extend this act.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Can the gentleman, or perhaps some member of the committee advise me what is the basis for the distribution of these funds? As I read the report it says \$20,000 for each State, and then distribution of funds is based upon population; is that correct, I will ask the Chairman?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. SANTANGELO. There is no means test in this program?

Mr. COOLEY. It is based on population.

Mr. SANTANGELO. As I understand it then, the distribution of these funds is not on the basis of need, but is on the basis of the population of the State; is that the agricultural population or the total population?

Mr. COOLEY. The total population.

Mr. SANTANGELO. And the amount each State receives is \$20,000 before distribution of the remaining funds?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN].

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the legislation before us. I have always thought that the heart of good education is good teaching. I remember a conversation

with the president of our South Dakota State College a couple of years ago in which he said that his most serious problem was his inability to retain the services of many of his best professors because of inadequate salaries.

This legislation will improve the salary level of some of the key faculty members of our State colleges. I hope that the measure will be approved.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of H.R. 10876.

The bill, which has been adequately explained, has the support of the land-grant colleges and universities of the Nation, all of which offer courses for teaching in residence education.

In my congressional district is located the Pennsylvania State University—the land-grant university of the Keystone State—which is charged with the responsibility of making education at the higher level available at low cost to those students who can benefit from it.

Early last month Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of Pennsylvania State University, wrote me at length concerning H.R. 10876, and in doing so emphasized the importance of making funds authorized in the bill available to the land-grant institutions in order for them to fulfill their obligations as embodied in the act of Congress which created them.

At this point I should like to read from Dr. Walker's letter, dated June 16, 1960:

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: You are aware of the great demand that is being made on the land-grant institutions to increase their facilities in order to serve a greater number of students over the next decade. It has also been emphasized that such an increase in these funds is imperative in order to add additional teachers to take care of this increase in enrollment.

Recently I appeared before Governor Lawrence's committee on higher education to present the serious problems that are confronting the Pennsylvania State University with respect to future enrollments. The Governor's commission on higher education in 1957 pointed out that in Pennsylvania in 1955 there were approximately 558,000 college-age population and by 1970 there would be over 866,000 children of college age, or an increase of 55.5 percent. The university in 1958 prepared a long-range plan based on these data in order to determine what it should do to help the Commonwealth to meet this crisis.

In 1955, the Pennsylvania State University enrolled 12.3 percent of all full-time students in all colleges in Pennsylvania, or 14,054. A conservative projection to 1970 indicated that the university must increase this percentage to 17.8 or 43,179 students. In 1930 about 80 percent of the full-time enrollment in Pennsylvania colleges and universities was in private institutions, but since that time the percentage has been decreasing until by the fall of 1959 only 72 percent of the total were in private colleges, or about 93,500 out of 130,000 students enrolled in Pennsylvania. This of course places a great burden on the public institutions.

The proposed funds to be made available by H.R. 10876 will aid considerably in securing the additional teaching staff necessary for these projected enrollments at the university. Even now we could enroll 1,200 more

students in the fall of 1960 than in 1959, but because of lack of funds to secure additional teaching staff members we are forced to retain our same enrollment although we have sufficient facilities to house and accommodate many more students. I want to point out that these 1,200 students have been refused admission simply because funds are not available for adding new teachers, and 5,000 more have been refused admission because facilities are not available.

The Committee on Agriculture has enhanced our chances of meeting these needs by favorably reporting out the bills in question, and I hope Congress will recognize the importance of this proposed legislation and act favorably upon your bill. It is one of the most important steps that can be taken to assure many more deserving students the opportunity of securing additional education, which of course is so vitally important to the welfare of our country.

Very truly yours,

ERIC A. WALKER,
President, Pennsylvania State University.

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Walker's letter explains rather fully the situation facing the Pennsylvania State University. As the testimony taken by the committee shows, a similar situation is faced by the other land-grant colleges and universities of the Nation, therefore enactment of this bill is imperative.

In approving H.R. 10876 the Congress will assure land-grant colleges and universities additional funds to aid them to meet the present and future demands and thus assist many students to secure a higher education.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

"(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

"(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

"The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended

and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payments of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I wish to say that for the past 14 years, since these appropriations have come before our committee we have allowed the full amount requested each year. I think it was in 1953 that there was an attempt to cut this appropriation. There was such a demand from all over the country that it be continued that our committee reversed itself at that time, and it has become practically an annual appropriation. I am in favor of this increased appropriation because I think these land-grant colleges have been doing a wonderful job. However, I think we should also note that many of us who have favored a school construction law in this country have always referred to this kind of Federal aid to education that has been on our statute books for a hundred years. I think everyone admits that this is Federal aid to education. It has been a way of aiding education that has been acceptable to the vast majority of our people. When we vote for this legislation today, I hope those of you who vote for it will remember those of us who are asking for a school construction bill to be passed in this session of Congress before we adjourn, and remember that we also voted for this kind of legislation knowing full well that it is Federal aid to education.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10876) to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions, pursuant to House Resolution 586, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 3450, an identical bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

"(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

"(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

"The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10876) was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF RELOCATION ALLOWANCE BY FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 558 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2467) to amend the Act of September 7, 1950, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for Chantilly Airport for their moving expenses. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 558 provides for consideration of H.R. 2467, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for Chantilly Airport for their moving expenses. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 2467, as amended, would provide what could be termed a "relocation allowance" to reimburse the owners and tenants of land heretofore or hereafter acquired for the United States by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency for expenses and other losses incurred by such persons in the process and as a direct result of moving themselves, their families, and possessions because of such acquisition of land.

The Administrator would be authorized, to the extent administratively determined to be fair and reasonable, under regulations prescribed by him, to reimburse the owners and tenants for moving costs and other losses. The total of such reimbursement would in no event exceed 25 percent of the fair value of such parcel of land as determined by the Administrator. Further, no payment would be made unless an application therefor, supported by an itemized statement of the expenses, losses, and damages so incurred, is submitted to the Administrator within 1 year following the date of such acquisition or within 1 year following the date that the property is vacated by the applicant, whichever date is later; except that in the case of land acquired on or after July 1, 1958, and before the date of the enactment of this legislation, the application for reimbursement may be made within 1 year following the date the property is vacated by the applicant or within 1 year following the date of enactment of this legislation, whichever date is later.

In fairness to those persons forced to move to make way for the new airport for the Washington area, provision should be made to reimburse them for their moving expenses under the terms of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 558.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think this will be something of a precedent?

Mr. ALLEN. Personally, I am willing to wait and hear all those who held hearings on this bill. This is merely on the adoption of the rule.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2467) to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for Chantilly Airport for their moving expenses.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2467 with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia", approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 770), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 3."; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary is authorized, to the extent administratively determined to be fair and reasonable, under regulations prescribed by him, to reimburse the owners and tenants of land heretofore or hereafter acquired in connection with the airport at Chantilly, in Fairfax County, Virginia, for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by such owners and tenants, respectively, in the process and as a direct result of the moving of themselves and their families and possessions because of such acquisition of land, which reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payments in respect of such acquisition as may otherwise be authorized by law. The total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land shall in no event exceed 25 per centum of the fair value of such parcel of land as determined by the Secretary. No payment in reimbursement shall be made unless application therefor, supported by an itemized statement of the expenses, losses, and damages so incurred, shall have been submitted to the Secretary within one year

Public Law 86-658
86th Congress, S. 3450
July 14, 1960

AN ACT

74 STAT. 525.

To amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the Act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), is amended to read as follows:

Agriculture and
mechanic arts
colleges.
49 Stat. 439.

"SEC. 22. In order to provide for the more complete endowment and support of the colleges in the several States and Puerto Rico entitled to the benefits of the Act entitled 'An Act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts,' approved July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented (7 U.S.C. 301-328), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following amounts:

12 Stat. 503.

"(a) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$7,650,000; and

"(b) For the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$4,300,000.

"The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) shall be paid annually to the several States and Puerto Rico in equal shares. The sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (b) shall be in addition to sums appropriated in pursuance of paragraph (a) and shall be allotted and paid annually to each of the several States and Puerto Rico in the proportion to which the total population of each State and Puerto Rico bears to the total population of all the States and Puerto Rico as determined by the last preceding decennial census. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to sums appropriated or authorized under such Act of July 2, 1862, as amended and supplemented, and shall be applied only for the purposes of the colleges defined in such Act, as amended and supplemented. The provisions of law applicable to the use and payment of sums under the Act entitled 'An Act to apply a portion of the proceeds of the public lands to the more complete endowment and support of the colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts established under the provisions of an Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862,' approved August 30, 1890, as amended and supplemented, shall apply to the use and payment of sums appropriated in pursuance of this section."

26 Stat. 417.
7 USC 321-326,
328.

Approved July 14, 1960.

